Foreign
Broadcast
Information
Service
50
ANNIVERSARY
1941 - 1991

Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-91-119
Thursday
20 June 1991

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-91-119 CONTENTS *20 June 1991*

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Commentator Expects Further START Progress *[Moscow International]* 1

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Bessmertnykh Speech, Contacts at CSCE Reported 2
  Urges Pooling of CSCE Efforts *[TASS]* 2
  CSCE 'Cannot Be Subordinated' to NATO *[PRAVDA 20 Jun]* 2
  Meets Albanian, CSFR, Greek Counterparts *[TASS]* 3
Baltic States' Activities at Conference Reported 3
  Foreign Ministers Meet Baker *[Vilnius Radio]* 3
  Communists Circulate Statement *[Vilnius International]* 3
Ignatenko on Summit Dates, Gorbachev G-7 Trip *[IZVESTIYA 20 Jun]* 4

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Boris Yeltsin Continues U.S. Visit 5
  Talks With Reporters *[Moscow Radio]* 5
  'Vremya' Shows Arrival *[Moscow TV]* 5
  Sees 'Balance' in Relations With Gorbachev *[PRAVDA 20 Jun]* 6
  Addresses Washington Embassy Reception *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 20 Jun]* 6
  Meets With Congress *[TASS]* 7
  Further on Talks With Congress *[TASS]* 7
  Seeks Cooperation, Not Aid *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 19 Jun]* 8
Reaction to Bush Mideast Arms Race Remarks *[PRAVDA 18 Jun]* 9
U.S. Conversion Delegation May Include Japanese *[INTERFAX]* 9

China

Polozkov, Russian CP Delegation Arrive in PRC *[TASS]* 10
Special Region Delegation Visits Vladivostok *[IZVESTIYA 17 Jun]* 10
Harbin Fair Shows 'Real Interest' in Trade *[PRAVDA 18 Jun]* 10

Northeast Asia

Yakutia Ready To Export Gas to Japan *[INTERFAX]* 11
Japanese Red Cross Launches 'Major' Aid Project *[TASS]* 11
South Korean TV Sets Assembled in Tokmak *[Moscow TV]* 11

East Europe

Last Soviet Troops Withdraw From CSFR *[Prague CTK]* 12
  Further on Withdrawal *[Moscow TV]* 12
Gorbachev Role in Prague Session 'Not Yet Clear' *[Budapest MTI]* 12
Health Ministry Ignorant of Todorov Whereabouts *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 19 Jun]* 12

West Europe

Delors Arrives in Moscow To Discuss Aid *[TASS]* 13
    Meets With Pavlov, Primakov *[Moscow TV]* 13
Gorbachev Airs Issues with Greek Party Leader *[TASS]* 13
Gorbachev Greets Swiss President on Anniversary *[PRAVDA 14 Jun]* 13
Lukyanov Cited on London Impressions, G-7 Hopes *[PRAVDA 18 Jun]* 14
CPSU's Falin Appraises WW II Conference *[PRAVDA 17 Jun]* 14
Oleynik Hails 'Useful' Meeting on Nations *[PRAVDA 14 Jun]* 15
Report on Links With European Energy Charter *[INTERFAX]* 15
Finnish Forestry Experts Work in North Russia *[INTERFAX]* 16
First Shipment of EC Humanitarian Aid Arrives *[TASS]* 16

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Supreme Soviet

PRAVDA Reports Pavlov 17 Jun Speech *[18 Jun]* 17
'Vesti' Views Pavlov Power Bid *[Moscow TV]* 19
Deputy Urges More Powers for Prime Minister *[Moscow Radio]* 20
IZVESTIYA Reports Debate on Gorbachev Powers *[20 Jun]* 20
Viktor Kucherenko Criticizes Yavlinskiy Plan *[Moscow TV]* 22
Alksnis on Accountability for Economic 'Fiasco' *[Moscow TV]* 23
Supreme Court Head on Provisions for Jury Trial *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 15 Jun]* 24
Constitution Committee Head Interviewed *[Moscow TV]* 24
Supreme Soviet Agenda for 20 Jun *[moscow Radio]* 26

Political & Social

TASS Reports Cabinet of Ministers Meeting 26
Shcherbakov Interviewed on Economic Issues *[Moscow TV]* 26
Justice Minister Discusses Union Treaty *[Moscow TV]* 28
Gorbachev Remarks to Peasant Congress Cited *[IZVESTIYA 20 Jun]* 29
MVD Crime Chief Says Weapons Decree Working *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 15 Jun]* 30
Union, Republic MVD's Discuss Anticrime Effort *[PRAVDA 19 Jun]* 30
Shevardnadze Record In, Out of Office Criticized *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 15 Jun]* 30
Possibility of CPSU Split Discussed *[Moscow TV]* 33
IZVESTIYA Protests Anti-Glasnost Offensive *[ROSSISKAYA GAZETA 19 Jun]* 37
TASS Reviews Press for 20 Jun 37

Economic

New Customs Duties To Be Introduced 1 Jul *[TASS]* 38
U.S. Businesses Continue Move Into USSR 38
    IBM Opens Subsidiary *[TASS]* 38
    Gillette in Joint Venture *[INTERFAX]* 39
Falin Rejects Harvard Aid in Drafting Plan *[Munich SUEDDEUTSCHE ZEITUNG 20 Jun]* 39
Falin Deplores State of Soviet Economy *[Hamburg DIE WELT 19 Jun]* 39
Economic Model for Coming Year Questioned *[PRAVDA 19 Jun]* 40
System 'Breaking Up' as Result of Reforms *[PRAVDA 18 Jun]* 41
Delhi Conference on Aeroflot's Performance Abroad *[Moscow TV]* 42

Agricultural

CPSU's Falin Warns of Crop Failure *[Moscow TV]* 42
    Harvest Prospects Reported *[Moscow TV]* 42
    State of Crops Described *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 15 Jun]* 43
Priority Given to Food Processing Projects *[PRAVDA 14 Jun]* 43

Military

- Withdrawal of Troops From Hungary Completed *[TASS]* 45
- Defense Official on Republican Armed Forces *[IAN MILITARY BULLETIN Apr-May]* 45
- Admiral Chernavin Writes on Lessons of War *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 20 Jun]* 46
- Military, Naval Reform Prospects Viewed *[IAN MILITARY BULLETIN Apr-May]* 47
  - Reform Problems Viewed *[IAN MILITARY BULLETIN Apr-May]* 49
- French Officer Impressed by Western Group Flier *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 14 Jun]* 51
- No Easy Alternative to Military Service Allowed *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 15 Jun]* 51
- Shlyaga Defends Army's Military-Political Bodies *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 18 Jun]* 51
- Report on Sale of Missile Cruiser Abroad Denied *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 14 Jun]* 51

REGIONAL AFFAIRS

Baltic Republics

- 'Government Crisis' Averted in Estonia *[Moscow Radio]* 52
- Deputy Lists Estonian Government's 'Faults' *[Tallinn Radio]* 52
- Estonians Dissatisfied With Government Policy *[IZVESTIYA 14 Jun]* 52
- Latvia To Privatize State, Collective Farms *[Moscow Radio]* 52
- Landsbergis Says Treaty With Russia Possible *[TASS]* 52
- Landsbergis on Baltic Republics CSCE Role *[Berlin ADN]* 53
- Landsbergis Goes to Scandinavia, France, Germany *[Radio Vilnius]* 53
- Landsbergis Interviewed on Independence *[Warsaw ZYCIE WARSZAWY 17 Jun]* 54
- Lithuanian Official Telegrams Pugo, Doguzhiyev *[BALTFAX]* 55
- Lithuanian Views Soviet Troop Action 3 Jun *[BALTFAX]* 55
- Baltic Communist Parties on Human Rights *[BALTFAX]* 56

RSFSR

- TASS Carries Final RSFSR Election Results 56
  - Electoral Commission Comments *[Moscow Radio]* 56
  - Moscow Party Chief on 'Defeat' *[TASS]* 57
  - Yeltsin on Presidential Tasks *[Radio Rossii]* 57
  - Support for Zhironovskiy 'Alarming' *[TASS]* 58
  - Zhirinovskiy Views Election *[Prague LIDOVE NOVINY 17 Jun]* 58
- RSFSR Supreme Soviet Proceedings 19 Jun *[Moscow TV]* 59
  - Debate on Bills Detailed *[TASS]* 60
  - No-Confidence in Abdulatipov Cited *[Moscow Radio]* 60
- Moscow City Council Begins Vote for New Chair *[TASS]* 61
  - Gonchar Wins Election *[TASS]* 61
- Leningrad Mayor Anatoliy Sobchak Interviewed *[IZVESTIYA 19 Jun]* 61
  - Joint Patrolling Ruling Reported *[IZVESTIYA 19 Jun]* 63
- Silayev Heads Discussion on Economic Program *[TASS]* 63
- Tatar President Ready To Cooperate With Russia *[Moscow Radio]* 63
- Makhachkala Muslims Regret Troubles Over Hajj *[Moscow TV]* 64
- Russian Internal Troops Exercise Begins in Omsk *[Moscow Radio]* 64

Western Republics

- Belorussian Parliament Rejects Strikers' Demands *[TASS]* 64
- 'Belorussian Communists for Democracy' Formed *[Radio Vilnius]* 64
- Belorussian Group Opposes Changing USSR's Name *[PRAVDA 19 Jun]* 65
- Reportage on Ukraine Supreme Soviet Session 65
  - Near Split Over Appointments Noted *[TASS]* 65
  - Economic Laws Approved *[Moscow Radio]* 65
- Ukraine's Khmara Calls Trial 'Farce' *[INTERFAX]* 66
- Ukrainian War Commemoration Day Announced *[IZVESTIYA 17 Jun]* 66
- Deeds Exchanged Ratifying Ukrainian-Kyrgyz Treaty *[TASS]* 66
- Moldovan Leaders Congratulate Yeltsin on Election *[TASS]* 66

Caucasus

Gamsakhurdia Interviewed by Turkish Daily *[SAKARTVELOS RESPUBLIKA 7 Jun]* 66
International Observers Assess Georgian Elections *[SVOBODNAYA GRUZIYA 7 Jun]* 69
Georgia's Democratic Center Elects Ruling Body *[SAKARTVELOS RESPUBLIKA 11 Jun]* 70
New NKAO Leaders View Contact With Azerbaijan *[Yerevan International]* 71
Army Helicopters Transport Deportees to Armenia *[Yerevan Radio]* 71
Polyanichko Warns Armenia of Territory Loss *[ARMENPRES]* 71
Armenian Criminal Code Amended *[IZVESTIYA 19 Jun]* 71
Army Still Shelling Armenia's Kapan Airport *[Yerevan Radio]* 72
Azerbaijan KGB Warns Against Armenian Terrorism *[Yerevan Radio]* 72
New Azerbaijan Council of Ministers Published *[BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY 25 May]* 72

Central Asia

Kazakhstan President Explains Proposal on Summit *[INTERFAX]* 72
Tolerance of Religion Eases Uzbek Draft Problems *[IZVESTIYA 14 Jun]* 73
Uzbekistan Movement Hails Yeltsin Election *[INTERFAX]* 73
Kyrgyz Pilgrims Continue To Depart for Hajj *[TASS]* 73

Commentator Expects Further START Progress

LD1906121891 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 1210 GMT 18 Jun 91

[Yuriy Solton commentary]

[Text] The announcement by President Bush that he has received what he termed as a positive letter from Mikhail Gorbachev concerning the strategic arms reduction problem has given rise to quite a few speculations about further progress of the START talks. And Yuriy Solton has this comment:

President Bush was very reserved in his assessments. According to him it was no breakthrough yet, but unquestionable progress. The difference gap has narrowed and the START treaty, which leaves 1,600 strategic arms delivery vehicles and 6,000 warheads for either of the sides, is now ready, not by 95 but by 96 percent, as President Bush has put it. The treaty defines a balance in the strategic field. Any error committed in it may turn into a factor bound to undermine stability.

The questions remaining unresolved, though referred to as technical, are actually very serious. It's the control of the production of strategic arms, it's the exchange of information about their testing and the definition of characteristics for new kinds of strategic missiles. I see no point in guessing how quickly the talks over the remaining problems will develop. Twelve years ago on 18 June an agreement on reducing strategic offensive weapons was signed by the Soviet Union and the United States in Vienna. Ever since, the work has been going on, with some interruptions, over a new agreement. And this new agreement is almost ready. Against this background it's not so important, I think, if the negotiations over it last one more month or end a month earlier. The most important thing is that both the Soviet and the American sides are determined at the highest level to make this agreement a reality. In fact, President Gorbachev and President Bush are considered to be the unofficial participants in the talks. They have to interfere whenever the talks are deadlocked.

One more statement by President Bush is worthy of attention. He said he had left blank spots in his schedule at the end of June or at the beginning of July, looking forward to this meeting with Mikhail Gorbachev. He gave to understand that he was ready to have such a meeting with President Gorbachev even if not all the i's would be dotted and all the t's crossed in the agreement. This statement reaffirms the intention of the American Administration to go ahead with its policy aimed at promoting relations of understanding with the Soviet Union. Moscow approaches its relations with the United States from a similar stand.

On 20 June, the Soviet foreign minister, Aleksandr Bessmertnykh, is expected to meet the American secretary of state, James Baker, in Berlin. The two officials will examine disarmament and other problems dealing with the preparation of a Soviet-American summit. And I think we have every reason to count on further progress, Yuriy Solton writes in conclusion.

Bessmertnykh Speech, Contacts at CSCE Reported

Urges Pooling of CSCE Efforts

LD1906222791 Moscow TASS in English 2206 GMT 19 Jun 91

[By TASS special correspondents Vladimir Pavlyushin, Konstantin Savvin, and Georgiy Shmelev]

[Text] Berlin June 20 TASS—The first meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers of the member-countries of the Conference for Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) ended its first day of work in Berlin on Wednesday.

The foreign ministers of European countries, Canada and the United States met at the octagonal table in the Reichstag building to discuss the activity of the newly created structures and mechanisms of the evolution of the European process.

The discussion focussed on Europe's new architecture and the further building of a continent of security and cooperation. In a symbolic gesture the forum chaired by German Minister of Foreign Affairs Hans-Dietrich Genscher began its work with adopting Albania as the 35th member-country of the Conference for Security and Cooperation in Europe. Genscher said this council decision was a new major step towards a single and free Europe.

German Chancellor Helmut Kohl greeted the participants in the conference and stressed that the Berlin ministerial meeting was expected to lay the foundation for a new culture of community life of nations in Europe by replacing confrontation by good- neighborliness, competition with cooperation and hegemony with equality. This must become our continent's strategy for the future, he said. A democratic Soviet Union committed to new thinking will take a worthy place in Europe, the German chancellor said.

The meeting continued behind closed doors. The foreign ministers of Poland, Czechoslovakia and Austria made three introductory statements on the role of current European structures and prospects of their development, journalists learned.

Speakers in the discussion included U.S. Secretary of State James Baker and the foreign ministers of Italy, Sweden, Luxembourg, Belgium, Cyprus and Spain.

Soviet Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh's address evoked a special interests. A Soviet delegation member told TASS that the attention of the foreign ministers was drawn to the Soviet foreign minister's proposal for a Europe of unified spaces. He called for pooling the efforts of CSCE member-countries to solve problems on the scale of the entire zone involved in the CSCE process. European security and stability call for the transition to structures encompassing the entire continent, not just some of its parts. If this does not happen, the Soviet foreign minister stressed, not interaction but counteraction is bound to set in. According to the Soviet delegate, Bessmertnykh stressed that the CSCE aims cannot be subordinate either to NATO purposes, or to political ambitions of other European formations.

According to the Soviet delegate, Bessmertnykh pointed to the need for a consistent strategy to create non-bloc European-scale structures—an effective tool for the solution of problems facing CSCE members.

The Soviet Union, he said, favors wider functions for the conflict prevention centre, an enhanced role for the committee of senior officials, the creation of agencies for economic, scientific and technical cooperation and the adoption of European programmes in the economic, ecological, transportation, scientific and technological fields.

Hans-Dietrich Genscher met journalists on Wednesday. He said the council meeting that opened in Berlin imparted a new quality to the CSCE process. This was evident in the style and spirit of the discussion. Considerable efforts were taken to find mechanisms to prevent and eliminate conflicts, Genscher said.

He told journalists that the forum adopted a statement on the situation in Yugoslavia. The statement expresses support for the democratic development, unity and territorial integrity of Yugoslavia, as well as for the peaceful settlement of the current crisis there.

The Thursday morning meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers of the CSCE member-countries will be held behind closed doors. The ministers are expected to discuss social and economic problems of central and eastern Europe. Upon the conclusion of the forum's work Hans-Dietrich Genscher will sum up the results of the two days of the council discussions at a news conference.

CSCE 'Cannot Be Subordinated' to NATO

PM1906205291 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Jun 91 Second Edition p 4

[Correspondent A. Stepanov report: "Opening Session in Berlin"]

[Excerpts] Berlin, 19 Jun—Only seven months have passed since the day in fall when a document was signed in Paris that was to be—we fervently hoped—the last handful of earth thrown onto the grave of the cold war that had, for decades, torn Europe apart. And our whole planet.

At 1000, when the conference was just beginning work—it was opened by the chairman, FRG Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher—34 flags fluttered in front of the Reichstag building. By dinner time, there were 35: A new CSCE member had been added—Albania, which has pledged to fulfill all the demands arising from the spirit and letter of the Final Act.

FRG Chancellor Helmut Kohl delivered a speech. [passage omitted]

USSR Foreign Minister A.A. Bessmertnykh, as has become known from the words of a member of the Soviet delegation, stressed in his speech at the conference that the CSCE process cannot be subordinated either to NATO's objectives or to the political principles of other existing European formations. All these organizations must work for the CSCE process if we want the European idea to prevail, if we want to confirm our belief that the CSCE process could become the instrument of coordinating the efforts of all the participating states.

Meets Albanian, CSFR, Greek Counterparts

LD2006030991 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0005 GMT 20 Jun 91

[Text] Berlin, 20 Jun (TASS)—A.A. Bessmertnykh, USSR minister of foreign affairs, held a series of meetings here on Wednesday with his European colleagues who are in Berlin in connection with the CSCE Council of Ministers of Foreign Affairs session.

A.A. Bessmertnykh had a conversation with M. Kapllani, minister of foreign affairs of Albania. The Soviet minister congratulated Albania on becoming a participant enjoying full rights in the CSCE process, which took place today, something the Soviet Union has consistently spoken in favor of. The ministers agreed on cooperation within the CSCE framework, as well as the more active development of Soviet-Albanian relations.

In the course of A.A. Bessmertnykh's meeting with J. Dienstbier, CSFR minister of foreign affairs, the prospects for the development of Soviet-Czechoslovak relations were examined. The importance of concluding a new treaty between the two countries which will lay a reliable foundation for this was noted.

A.A. Bessmertnykh and G. De Michelis, Italian minister of foreign affairs, exchanged opinions on the significance and potential of the forthcoming meeting in London between USSR President Gorbachev and leaders of the Seven. Other international problems of mutual interest were also touched on.

During Bessmertnykh's conversation with S. Andersson, Swedish minister of foreign affairs, the sides stated with satisfaction that USSR President M.S. Gorbachev's recent visit to Sweden imparted a good impetus to the further advancement of relations between the two countries. Among other issues the ministers discussed in a spirit of mutual interest the possibilities for cooperation between the USSR and the Council of Europe, as well as the state of affairs on a Near East settlement.

The Soviet minister discussed with his Greek colleague Samaras the practical aspects of preparing for the Greek prime minister's upcoming visit to Moscow which will be an important event in relations between the two countries. An exchange of opinions took place on Europe, regional, and world problems.

A.A. Bessmertnykh and A. Nastase, Romanian minister of foreign affairs, reviewed the state of Soviet-Romanian relations which are well founded for advancing dynamic development in different spheres.

Baltic States' Activities at Conference Reported

Foreign Ministers Meet Baker

LD1906215791 Vilnius Radio Vilnius Network in Lithuanian 2000 GMT 19 Jun 91

[Text] The Lithuanian, Latvian, and Estonian foreign ministers met with U.S. Secretary of State James Baker at 1500 today in the Reichstag building in Berlin.

Latvian Foreign Minister Janis Jurkans told a BALTIC NEWS AGENCY correspondent that the meeting had results but was also very informative. The foreign ministers and the secretary of state exchanged views on the further participation of the Baltic states in the Helsinki process. Latvia's Janis Jurkans noted that the Baltic states intend to take part in a meeting of experts from national minorities to be held in July in Geneva. This meeting is also a part of the European security and cooperation process. Janis Jurkans noted that this will be another practical step in striving for the consolidation of the Baltic states in the European international community.

Janis Jurkans also noted in his interview with the correspondent that raising the Baltic states' status in the Helsinki process depends to a great extent on the international political situation, but mostly on the further development of relations between the Soviet Union and the Baltic states and on the situation in the Soviet Union itself.

In the meeting with James Baker all four participants expressed the opinion that the signing of the new Union treaty may greatly change the situation of the Baltic states both in the European process and in relations with the Soviet Union, and this will unavoidably influence the change in the status of the Baltic states.

After the meeting between the Baltic foreign ministers and the U.S. secretary of state a discussion with an unofficial group supporting the Baltic states took place. The meeting decided that if after the Geneva meeting the status of the Baltic states does not change, measures will be taken to invite their representatives as the guests of many delegations. Janis Jurkans noted that the group supporting the Baltic states was formed by [word indistinct] representatives and includes figures of various ranks and deputy foreign ministers.

Communists Circulate Statement

LD1906221291 Vilnius Radio Vilnius in English 2130 GMT 19 Jun 91

[Text] A correspondent of the BALTIC NEWS AGENCY reports from Berlin that the International Human Rights organization has sent an open letter to the executive secretary of the foreign ministers conference in

Berlin. It protests against the registration of participants representing nongovernmental organizations. Those are members of the Baltic communist parties and the United Socialist Party of Germany.

It is pointed out that, among other things, Edmundas Kasperavicius, who represents the Lithuanian Communist Party, works at the occupied Lithuanian television.

The letter demands that guests at the conference who represent nongovernmental organizations should not be affiliated to any political party.

Meanwhile, the Baltic communists today circulated a statement at the Berlin conference to the effect that human rights are violated in the Baltic countries. The statement accuses the governments of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia of allegedly conducting a policy of ideological and ethnic discrimination. It asserts that differently minded people are persecuted in the Baltic states.

The representatives of the Baltic communist parties addressed the participants in the Berlin conference, asking to support the efforts of the Soviet leadership and President Gorbachev to preserve an integral Soviet Union.

Ignatenko on Summit Dates, Gorbachev G-7 Trip

PM1906194891 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 20 Jun 91 Union Edition p 2

[Report on 18 June press briefing by Vitaliy Ignatenko, head of the USSR president's press service, by G. Alimov: "Why the President Is Going to London"]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted]

On the Prospects for a Meeting of the Soviet and U.S. Presidents This question remains at the center of attention. And the interest in whether this summit meeting will take place is entirely natural. A specific date has not yet been set. But as the leader of the president's press service reported, the other day G. Bush received a very important letter from M. Gorbachev, proposing solutions to the questions that remain unresolved. As far as we know, V. Ignatenko said, G. Bush took a positive view of this message. Now obviously, this document has to be studied by experts and specialists. Speaking about the prospects for a visit by the U.S. President to Moscow, the speaker at the briefing reported that the U.S. leader is still keeping the last week of June and the last week of July free in his working diary. Mikhail Sergeyevich is keeping the same dates free in his diary.

Why Is M. Gorbachev Going to London?

On this subject, the president's aide, returning yet again to the subject, offered this explanation:

"I do not share the view of some of my esteemed journalist colleagues that the USSR president will be going to London hat in hand. It is not so much a matter of credits. Measures in the sphere of financial aid to our country are seen mainly in terms of the resolution of specific problems. Like, for instance, support for the convertibility of the ruble, the creation of a proper infrastructure for light industry and the food and processing industry, and the transfer of modern technologies. And the most important thing we must seek is the synchronization of our economic structure, our reforms, with what is happening in the highly developed industrial countries. Incidentally, V. Pavlov has also spoken about that."

Colleagues Concerned About the Situation at IZVESTIYA

A journalist inquired about the conflict at our newspaper, describing it as unpleasant, and asked whether the president knows about it. The answer was in the affirmative. In V. Ignatenko's opinion, the conflict is purely a personnel matter. And it is not the president's job to concern himself with personnel on this newspaper. This is the prerogative of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, or the IZVESTIYA editorial collegium itself. A conflict in such a noteworthy newspaper, the aide to the USSR president said, is a very painful matter; it affects the whole body of journalists, but we know that at IZVESTIYA they are mainly good and wise people, fine journalists, and we believe that everything will be carefully balanced. We hope that the sensible people at IZVESTIYA will assess the situation sensibly. "We hope for a favorable outcome," V. Ignatenko observed.

United States & Canada

Boris Yeltsin Continues U.S. Visit

Talks With Reporters

LD1906165191

[Editorial Report] Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian at 1130 GMT on 19 June carries a six-minute report by Sergey Pustovoyt from the United States on the program for Boris Yeltsin's U.S. visit, which is expected to last until 21 June.

Pustovoyt begins by recalling Yeltsin's recent election as Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] president, which adds importance to a visit arranged long ago. Yeltsin will meet the President, vice president, trade and defense ministers, congressmen, journalists and scientists, he says. He states that Yeltsin met with compatriots at Shannon Airport during a refuelling stop, and was congratulated on his election. He adds: "Barbara McDougall, Canada's minister of employment and education, flew specially into the Canadian airport of Gander in Newfoundland to meet Boris Yeltsin. She expressed great interest in trading with Russia and in developing bilateral business ties, all the more so since in connection with the January events in the Baltic area Canadian aid to the USSR has been halted. The interest in cooperation between Russia and Canada is mutual."

Pustovoyt went on to say: "During the flight to the United States I was able to chat with Boris Nikolayevich. He said that he expects to sign a whole range of agreements between Russia and the United States, covering both the political and economic spheres. Among possible forms of mutual cooperation Yeltsin singled out the establishment of joint banks and transport companies, the joint development of motor vehicle engines, work in conversion, and the processing of agricultural produce. Russia is fairly rich in resources and intellectual potential, Yeltsin added, and we have no intention of going cap in hand to the West. Russia is capable of putting its own house in order. On the matter of mutual ties, the present trip to the United States and the process of drawing up a new Union treaty, Boris Yeltsin noted that the recent Novo-Ogarevo meeting, which lasted for six hours on 17 June, demonstrated that there remain virtually no differences among the nine republics taking part in the meeting. The conversation held the same day by Yeltsin, Gorbachev, and Nazarbayev ended with a decision to support the plan for the economic transformation of our country proposed by Grigoriy Yavlinskiy. On this, Yeltsin noted that Gorbachev's agreement was not obtained without hesitation—'via Pavlov', the president of Russia said. Boris Yeltsin said that the positive progress made in the Novo-Ogarevo process has made possible the signing of a new Union treaty at the end of July this year.

"Answering a question about the relationship between Yeltsin and Gorbachev, Boris Nikolayevich noted that, following his election as president of Russia, Gorbachev has drastically changed his attitude to him and has not even tried to make it appear a gradual change. In connection with his election as president of Russia, Yeltsin said that his first few decrees have already been prepared and that the very first of these, to follow immediately after he has been sworn in on 10 July, will probably be a decree on education reform, since education, in Yeltsin's words, is the basis of the revival of Russia."

Pustovoyt enumerates Yeltsin's activities since his arrival in Washington: "Late last night Moscow time, which is already daytime in Washington, Boris Yeltsin and his team arrived in the U.S. capital. In the very first minutes after the aircraft landed at Andrews Air Force Base in Washington, it became clear that his reception on American soil was most unlike Yeltsin's previous meetings abroad. Greeting him at the aircraft steps was Bob Dole, the leader of the Republican minority in the Senate, who clearly said it all, noting that Boris Yeltsin is the first president of Russia who has been freely elected by all the people and therefore his words while in America can be viewed not only as the point of view of a government representative; in the view of the Americans; the people are speaking through Yeltsin, senator Bob dole noted. Yeltsin's assertion that the end has finally come in Russia for Communist totalitarianism and that Russia is striving to enter the family of civilized states caused outbursts of applause at a special reception in the Soviet Embassy in Washington in honor of the Russian president.

"Late that evening local time—morning already in Moscow—Boris Yeltsin appeared on the popular television program 'Nightline'—that means Night Life in Russian. On that program he explained the aims of his visit to the Americans."

Pustovoyt goes on to outline today's agenda, meeting members of the Senate and House of Representatives and AFL-CIO officials and being awarded an international prize for democracy.

'Vremya' Shows Arrival

LD1906200491 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 19 Jun 91

[Video report from Washington by correspondent B. Kalyagin—from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin has arrived in the United States on a working visit.

[Kalyagin] It is Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin's second visit to the United States. His first visit, in autumn 1989, evoked contradictory comments here. But today there is great interest in the visit. This is shown by the packed program for the Russian leader's stay in America, which includes a meeting with the U.S. President.

Boris Nikolayevich, what can Russia and the Soviet Union expect of your current visit?

[Yeltsin] First of all, America and its political figures, leaders, and administrative and business circles should know what Russia is like today and what it wants, and with what intentions it has now entered a new historic epoch, I should say, when the people have already expressed their attitude to democracy—the way Russia will follow unswervingly, the way of stabilizing the economy and switching to market relations. I think that we will also discuss issues of direct contacts between Russia and America within the framework of general fundamental U.S.-Soviet accords.

[Kalyagin] Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin arrived in the United States at the invitation of the leadership of Congress. And naturally, his first meetings took place on Capitol Hill, where the legislators meet. Possibilities for developing contacts between deputies of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Supreme Soviet and the American Congress were discussed. Then Boris Yeltsin had a meeting with U.S. senators. In the course of it an exchange of views on foreign political problems and the situation in the Soviet Union took place.

American observers note that this time Yeltsin has come to the United States backed by an impressive mandate from his compatriots, which he received in the elections for RSFSR president. This is bound to boost his prestige in the United States. At the same time, the U.S. Administration does not support the idea of developing separate links with Soviet republics. Marlin Fitzwater, White House press secretary, stressed that over all these years the United States has always had relations with the Soviet Union's central government, and this will not change.

Sees 'Balance' in Relations With Gorbachev

PM1906183691 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
20 Jun 91 First Edition p 4

[Report by correspondent V. Gan under general heading: "Yeltsin in America"]

[Excerpts] Washington, 19 Jun—B.N. Yeltsin's visit began in Washington today. The visit, organized at the invitation of leaders of the U.S. Senate, is described as a working visit. The guest's program includes, as he himself said, meetings with the country's top political leadership, parliamentarians, representatives of business circles, the press, and the U.S. public. The most "sensational" day of the visit will be Thursday. At the invitation of President G. Bush, B.N. Yeltsin will visit the White House.

Administration officials admit quite frankly that Yeltsin's arrival puts them in a difficult position. On the one hand, nobody is going to deny that Washington will henceforth be dealing with a man who has the confidence of millions of people in Russia and who has a mandate to govern the Union's biggest republic. On the other hand, the White House, having "bet on Gorbachev," would—according to sources close to it—in no way wish to undermine the equilibrium that has been established. [passage omitted]

Your correspondent asked B.N. Yeltsin this question:

"People here are writing that the future of the Union and of Russia depends on your working in tandem with Gorbachev. What is your view on that?"

"I think they are right," he said. "Only this should not be seen as in any way a matter of personalities. It is a matter of relations on a rather principled footing. It is a question of positions that do not entirely converge... Since the signing of the 'Nine Plus One' agreement, I would say, a balance has emerged in our relations. That does not mean that we simply say yes to each other. We are conducting a businesslike discussion. If there are certain differences, for instance, on the draft Union Treaty, we try to find a compromise. On some issues, differences still persist..."

Addresses Washington Embassy Reception

PM1906184891 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA
in Russian 20 Jun 91 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "B.N. Yeltsin's Working Visit to the United States"]

[Excerpts] Washington, 19 Jun—"What we expect from this visit is the establishment of direct dialogue between Russia and the United States in the interests of strengthening the stability of relations between the USSR and the United States and consolidating the positive processes in the world," B.N. Yeltsin, chairman of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet, stated in the U.S. capital on Tuesday.

He is here on a working visit at the invitation of the U.S. Congress leadership. [passage omitted]

On the same day a reception in honor of B.N. Yeltsin was held at the Soviet Embassy in the United States, attended by representatives of the U.S. Administration, senators and congressmen, and representatives of American business circles and the public. "Most unusual changes, I would say changes of great historic importance, are taking place in Russia," B.N. Yeltsin told those present. "A 150-million-strong people has had the opportunity to elect the president of Russia directly. This has happened thanks to the process of democratization that began in 1985 on Gorbachev's initiative." Speaking about the complex domestic political situation in the USSR, the Russian leader gave a posstive assessment of the 23 April "Nine Plus One" statement, which, he said, "was a turning point."

Meets With Congress

LD1906170891 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1636 GMT 19 Jun 91

[Text] Washington, 19 June (TASS)—TASS correspndent Aleksey Berezhkov and Pavel Vanichkin: B.N. Yeltsin, chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Supreme Soviet, who is in the United States on a working visit, spent the first half of today in the U.S. Congress.

He had a conversation with G. Mitchell, Democratic majority leader in the Senate, and R. Dole, Republican minority leader. Replying to G. Mitchell's question about how his relations with USSR President M.S. Gorbachev are shaping up today, B.N. Yeltsin said, in part: "Since the signing of the 'Nine plus One' statement, relations have now become balanced and businesslike, yet we are not rejecting our principles.

Then the Russian leader had conversations with senators and in the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives. They covered the situation in the USSR, the program of economic and political reforms of the Russian Federation, and the state of and prospects for the development of Soviet-U.S. relations. The American legislators warmly congratulated B.N. Yeltsin on his victory in the presidential election in the RSFSR.

Further on Talks With Congress

LD2006045291 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0055 GMT 20 Jun 91

[By correspondents Aleksey Berezhkov, Pavel Vanichkin]

[Text] Washington, 20 Jun (TASS)—B.N. Yeltsin, Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Supreme Soviet chairman, who is in the United States on a working visit, spent the first half of the day at the U.S. Congress on Wednesday.

He had conversations with G. Mitchell, the leader of the Democratic majority in the Senate, and R. Dole, leader of the Republican minority in the Senate. He also had meetings with members of the House of Representatives Foreign Affairs Committee. The U.S. legislators warmly congratulated B.N. Yeltsin on his victory in the RSFSR presidential elections.

Responding to a request by TASS correspondents to assess his meetings with the legislators, B.N. Yeltsin said: "The leaders of congress proposed, in my view, a balanced and correct program for the visit. I would say that the meetings in Congress are an honor for me. An extremely wide spectrum of issues was discussed. The conversations were interesting, constructive, and held in an atmosphere of mutual respect. It seems to me that they listened to me with great attention, and I replied to all the questions with complete frankness, as always." Speaking at the House of Representatives Foreign Affairs Committee the Russian leader stated: "The people have received the opportunity to elect a president for the first time in the 1,000-year history of Russia. This points to the positive changes that are occurring in our country and in Russia. This is a continuation of the processes that Gorbachev, the country's present president, started in 1985. In that time both half measures have been taken and mistakes made, and naturally there are difficulties in renewing society. With respect to the election of a Russian president of I would like to stress that here this is not so much a question of personality, but of democratic forces triumphing. These elections indicate that in our country there is no other way except that of reforms in all spheres of life in Russia and the country as a whole. We will move along this path."

Then the leadership of both Houses of Congress gave a dinner in honor of B.N. Yeltsin, welcoming him as the first democratically elected president of Russia, G. Mitchell said in particular: "Your success or your defeat is in your hands, in the hands of the Russian people. The United States can offer support and limited assistance. We want you to know that we are giving this support and this assistance. We wish you success for the sake of peace and the future of your great country."

"We think that this a very important visit," said R. Dole in his turn. "I wish to note that we are very interested in the development of trade with every republic in the Soviet Union."

In his speech B.N. Yeltsin stressed that in the RSFSR elections the people opted for a president who has put forward "a program which includes a market economy, diversity and equality of all forms of ownership, including private property, handing over land to the peasants, land and credit and finance reforms, and freedom for foreign investors in Russia." "The people have firmly said that they are for Russia which is on the path to the civilized world, on the path that the majority of civilized countries in the world have traversed," the Russian leader stressed.

Replying to the question of how his relations with USSR President M.S. Gorbachev are taking shape today, B.N. Yeltsin said in part: "After signing the "Nine plus One" statement relations have now become balanced and businesslike. At the same time we do not back down from our principles."

Then the leader of Russia visited the Lincoln Memorial built in honor of one of the most outstanding U.S. presidents. Here a hearty welcome from the residents of the U.S. capital awaited B.N. Yeltsin. "On Thursday I will certainly tell President G. Bush about the way you welcomed me," B.N. Yeltsin told those gathered.

"Abraham Lincoln was a great man, a symbol of democracy," continued the Russian leader. "He saved the unity of the United States as a great state. He saved the freedom of a person, of the citizen, of the United States."

The next stage in the Russian leader's program in Washington was a visit to the headquarters of the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial

Organizations (AFL-CIO), where B.N. Yeltsin was welcomed by L. Kirkland, its president, on behalf of this, the country's major trade union association. In his speech, B.N. Yeltsin stressed that "the trade unions should develop independently of state and party structures" and in this connection he made a high appraisal of the recently formed Federation of Independent Trade Unions of Russia. At the same time he stressed that a genuinely independent trade union movement in the republic is "is still at the stage of coming into being" and it is therefore very important "to continue to learn from the wealth of trade union experience" of the United States.

Seeks Cooperation, Not Aid

PM1906143591 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 19 Jun 91 p 1

[Article by Vladimir Kuznechevskiy: "Not Western Aid But Mutually Advantageous Cooperation—This Is the Purpose of B.N. Yeltsin's U.S. Trip"]

[Text] The central mass media are readily saying a great deal about the two upcoming meetings between Mikhail Gorbachev and George Bush, one of which is to take place in London after the "G-7" session in the second half of July, and the second in Moscow in July or else in September-October. And almost nothing is being said about something of which the Western press, however, has recently been readily writing a great deal—Boris Yeltsin's visit to the United States during the period from 18 through 22 June and the Bush-Yeltsin meeting in Washington 20 June.

What the West's leading minds mean whenever they pronounce the words "the Soviet Union" is, above all, Russia. Dr. Heinrich Vogel, director of the Federal Institute for the Study of the East and International Relations (FRG), recently expressed very sober views in this regard: "Even given the further collapse of the internal empire, i.e. a contraction to the East Slav nucleus or Russia, and regardless of the result of the transformation process begun by Gorbachev, this country with its geographic scale, which possesses nuclear, bacteriological, and chemical weapons and also the ability to utilize outer space, remains a great power."

Boris Yeltsin is visiting Washington when the USSR president's closest entourage in the persons of Primakov and Vice Premier Shcherbakov tried to do everything to wreck Yavlinskiy's mission, the essence of which was to create a formula for **mutually advantageous** cooperation between the USSR and the West. Gorbachev's team, behind whose back stands the decisive yet shortsighted Premier Pavlov, replaced Yavlinskiy's formula with overstated demands for "naked" aid for the Soviet Union (and this in fact means for the union's leading administrative apparatus) with the help of overt blackmail—the threat of the USSR's disintegration. As a result, harm was caused, above all, to Gorbachev personally. Whereas, prior to his emissaries' U.S. trip, the Soviet president still had the possibility of being invited to the "G-7" session, after it Gorbachev was denied an invitation to the official session.

Such circus tricks do not work with Yeltsin. He demonstrated this quite clearly during Baker's recent visit to Moscow by refusing to attend a supper at the U.S. Embassy. To all appearances, unlike some other high politicians in Moscow, the president of Russia will not ask for the West's "naked" aid but will propose mutually advantageous cooperation between Russia and the United States—which is close to Yavlinskiy's formula.

There is another explanation which he will evidently have to make during his visit. There has recently been a great deal of emphasis on the idea that the West must, is simply obliged to, grant the USSR aid because, if it does not, the USSR might break up into pieces and its nuclear potential break up along with it. And if this happens, some of these nuclear weapons might suddenly (precisely "suddenly"!) end up in the hands of some irresponsible generals, and then an apocalypse awaits the whole world.

This idea does not come from Gorbachev or Primakov, although precisely they employ it more frequently than others. It has been brought to Moscow from the West. At any rate, as of last year Professor Yanov of New York University aired it repeatedly in Moscow.

Are there any grounds for this idea? Evidently not, when you get right down to it. The thing is that the USSR's nuclear potential is located mainly on the territory of three republics—the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic], the Ukraine, and Kazakhstan. Since last fall the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet has been raising the question of withdrawing nuclear weapons from Ukrainian territory. By all accounts, this will soon be done (if it has not already been done). With the closure of the Semipalatinsk nuclear test site in Kazakhstan the situation will change substantially in the direction of a sharp reduction in the presence of nuclear weapons on that republic's territory. But the weapons which will remain there even after this have always been controlled (and are controlled), in the main, by Russian generals and colonels. Thus, the USSR's nuclear potential, although under the jurisdiction of the union leadership, is overwhelmingly based on the RSFSR's territory and cannot be mobilized without the consent of its leadership.

And it is this that the Russian president must explain during his meetings with the U.S. Senate and President, dispelling the fashionable myth in the West of a possible nuclear apocalypse in the event of the Soviet Union's collapse. It is time to reassure public opinion in Western countries on this score. It is time, finally, to stop frightening them with the unpredictable behavior of the enigmatic Russian bear. I believe that the Russian president will be able to do this in the meetings with his interlocutors without wounding their pride.

Reaction to Bush Mideast Arms Race Remarks

PM1906100391 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Jun 91 Second Edition p 5

[Sergey Filatov "Viewpoint": "Near East: Farewell to Arms?"]

[Text] To cap the Gulf war, the victors have begun to ponder whether it is time to clear the Near East of the countless weapons systems that have piled up there in the years of Arab-Israeli confrontation. Sooner or later this conflict may flare up with fresh force and who knows what harm it may do the people of the planet. Atmospheric discharges from Kuwait's blazing oil wells are already beginning to change the climate in vast regions around the Persian Gulf.

That is why U.S. President G. Bush's recent proposals for an end to the arms race in the Near East and the Maghreb aroused a fairly animated reaction in the world and, primarily, in the region itself. Speaking in Colorado Springs, he called for the major suppliers of arms to these countries to display "restraint"; production of nuclear materials to be banned in the states of the region; for them to freeze the acquisition, production, and testing of "surface-to-surface" missiles; and subscribe to the Convention on the Prohibition and Elimination of Chemical Weapons and the Biological Weapons Convention. G. Bush also suggested beginning discussion of the problems raised at the meeting of the five permanent members of the UN Security Council, which are also effectively the main suppliers of arms to the Near East.

The initial response to the U.S. initiative among the Arabs has proved largely positive, but cautious. Egypt, Jordan, Saudi Arabia, the PLO, and Syria have expressed their interest in various ways. Israel has, for its part, said that the proposals are "very important," but it has "certain questions" as regards this plan.

Be that as it may, no one has uttered a definite "no." And that is a direct indication that the countries of the region are prepared in principle to discuss the problem of arms reduction. I think that each country approaches this problem from the viewpoint of its own security. And the U.S. plan does contain some elements that require clarification. For instance, the intention is to cease nuclear weapons production, but according to various data, Israel already possesses these weapons, while its Arab neighbors do not, and the latter cannot help but be concerned over this imbalance.

Nevertheless who would deny that there is of course a grain of sense in the U.S. proposals. It is for that reason that the permanent members of the UN Security Council will most likely be gathering in Paris for the proposed meeting. France, Britain, China, and the United States have agreed. Informed USSR Foreign Ministry sources say that Soviet diplomatic circles have reacted with interest to G. Bush's initiatives and are currently studying the question of a Soviet delegation taking part in this conference. It is after all high time to relieve the Near East of the arsenals that have piled up there.

U.S. Conversion Delegation May Include Japanese

OW1806111391 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1900 GMT 17 Jun 91

["The First Official U.S. Delegation on Questions of Conversion is Expected in the Soviet Union" (by Mikhail Mayorov, diplomatic correspondent)—following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] A group of American experts is expected in the USSR to discuss the conversion of defense industries. The Soviet Foreign Ministry has confirmed the fact, but given no further detailed information since the American side hasn't specified any exact date or programme of the visit. No confirmation followed on the possibility mooted in the media that the delegation may include Japanese experts.

At the Conversion Department of the Ministry's International Economic Relations Board our diplomatic correspondent has been told that this is to be the first official visit to the USSR of such high-level American experts on conversion, though there have been some contacts in this field. Last August specialists of the two countries met at the UN Conference on Conversion, and last November, they had a chance to meet here in Moscow at the bilateral seminar held by the Soviet Academy of Sciences.

They point out at the Soviet Foreign Ministry that conversion is becoming one of the most attractive fields for investments for American Businessmen. Some joint ventures are already working in that direction, others are being negotiated. The U.S. government agencies have shown, though little with to cooperate with the Soviet Union in this sphere, finding that a switch of any industry from defense to peaceful production should be determined by the amrket, and noting else [sentence as received].

The Department of Conversion also pointed out that American businessmen are seeking to deal with the highest level of technology in the Soviet defense industry. It follows that neither side stands to lose the high-tech it comanded in the past.

The Conversion Department was set up at the Soviet Foreign Ministry in January this year after passing a state programme of conversion in the USSR.

China

Polozkov, Russian CP Delegation Arrive in PRC

LD2006095291 Moscow TASS in English 0916 GMT 20 Jun 91

[By correspondent Vladimir Kashirov]

[Text] Beijing June 20 (TASS)—A delegation of functionaries of the Russian Communist Party led by Ivan Polozkov, member of the Politburo of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee and first secretary of the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party, arrived here today at the invitation of the Chinese Communist Party.

The main purpose of our visit to China is to familiarise ourselves with the economic, social and political situation in China, Polozkov told TASS on arrival at the airport. The Soviet Union is now at the crossroads, and we are to make a choice. China chose its own way of development. We should also look for our own way, adopting all that is useful and interesting in the experience of other countries. No foreign model in its original form will be suitable for us. This is why China's experience is of much interest to us, Polozkov said.

So far as inter-party relations with China are concerned, he continued, we should study more closely than ever the everyday work of the Chinese Communist Party. At a time when the communist movement in East European countries and Europe in general has been practically annihilated, a process of economic transformation in the economy and other spheres is successfully under way in China with the Chinese Communist Party playing the leading part. Thus, the leading role of the communist party is by no means the cause of the crisis phenomena, for which the Soviet Communist Party is blamed in the USSR. China's experience in this respect is very important and instructive for us, Polozkov said.

Special Region Delegation Visits Vladivostok

PM2006092391 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Jun 91 Union Edition p 2

[Report by Yuriy Balakirev: "Guests from China's Special Region"]

[Text] Vladivostok—The Chinese border city of Suifenhe with a population of 30,000 has offered economic assistance to Vladivostok.

Suifenhe, as an open city, has received from the PRC special rights and a preferential economic regime and is developing rapidly, having far outstripped in the past three to four years the Maritime Kray rayon center of Pogranichnyy. A delegation from this northernmost Chinese special region headed by the city's mayor, Zhao Mingfie, has visited Vladivostok, Nakhodka, Vostochnyy port, and Ussuriysk. There was a discussion with the Maritime Kray people of paths of cooperation, in particular the prospects for creating a special economic zone in the Grodekovo region, connected with Suifenhe by a railroad and a motor vehicle crossing.

The guests stated their readiness to earmark capital investments for any spheres of Maritime Kray's national economy on mutually advantageous terms.

Harbin Fair Shows 'Real Interest' in Trade

PM1906151591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Jun 91 Second Edition p 5

[Report by correspondent B. Barakhta: " 'Welcome!' Soviet-Chinese Fair"]

[Text] Harbin, 17 Jun—The second Sino-Soviet trade and industrial fair has opened in this city in the northeast PRC. More than 6,000 specialists and representatives of plants and factories have come to it from the USSR: Russian can be heard throughout the city. Many business people have come here from Khabarovsk and Maritime Krays.

The range of industrial and consumer goods on the Soviet stands is extremely varied. Automobiles, furs, tools with digital program control, clothing, stag antlers...

"The facts show," Jiang Zemin, general secretary of the CPC Central Committee, has said, "that China and the Soviet Union, both great socialist countries, have established and developed long-term, stable, good-neighborly, friendly relations..."

Nonetheless there is still tremendous untapped potential in the development of Sino-Soviet relations. Both sides' economic ties are mutually complementary to a considerable extent. This fair illustrates that. It is far larger and more impressive than last year's. Incidentally, Czechoslovak, Polish, and Mongolian representatives attended it for the first time.

Nor did the hosts disgrace themselves, so to speak. More than 2,000 enterprises, state associations, and joint enterprises displayed their output. Renowned Chinese natural silks and silk garments for export to Western Europe, canned products, personal computers, minitractors, and ball bearings... It is hard to list everything that was on show at the PRC exhibition in two large three-story pavilions and an area outside. There were, after all, thousands and thousands of exhibits.

The fact that a large number of Chinese business people came along indicates their real interest in trading with the USSR. Incidentally, PRAVDA enjoys tremendous respect and prestige among them. It is significant that many firms, corporations, and mixed enterprises (for instance, from the Shenzhen special economic zone) would like to publish advertisements in our newspaper.

Gu Yongjiang, PRC deputy minister of foreign economy and trade, noted that the Soviet Union has now become one of China's main trading and economic partners. This year the volume of our bilateral trade totaled almost $4 billion.

The fair will last through 24 June.

Northeast Asia

Yakutia Ready To Export Gas to Japan

OW2006065491 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1200 GMT 19 Jun 91

[From "Business Today"; following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Japan's Tokyo Boeki Ltd. and America's Far East Energy will probably become the main partners in implementing the Vostok project which provides for Soviet gas exports from Yakutia and the Southern Sakhalin to Japan via the Korean Peninsula.

Yakutia's Prime Minister, Mr. Kliment Ivanov, at the end of talks in Tokyo this week told an IF [INTERFAX] corespondent that agreement was reached on the first stage of the project which provides for Japanese companies to join the development of a feasibility plan later next year. It is expected that gas exports from Sakhalin to Japan will start in 1995 and from Yakutia in 1998.

Mr. Ivanov said the Japanese side had tried to get the project split into a number of separate deals. However, he said, the Soviet Union insists on an integrated approach to the project.

Mr. Ivanov spoke of some imminent difficulties. The Japanese Government is not in a hurry to implement the project because it has stable gas imports from the Middle East and Alaska until the year of 2015. In his view, construction work can hardly start earlier than five or seven years from now.

Yakutia's prime minister said his republic was keen to export local gas and could increase exports of gas by 25 billion cubic meters by 2005.

Japanese Red Cross Launches 'Major' Aid Project

LD1906082891 Moscow TASS in English 1444 GMT 18 Jun 91

[By correspondent Yuriy Vitrishyak]

[Text] Khabarovsk June 18 TASS—Japan's Red Cross has launched a major aid program to the Soviet Union. The first batch of medicine and food for hospitals and child-care facilities was delivered today. Similar loads will be regularly delivered to the Soviet Far East until the end of July.

Koichi Hiraide, the manager of the International Contacts Bureau of Japan's Red Cross, says that Japan is eager to help the Soviet Union cope with the complex economic situation.

"Our initiative to collect money was supported by Japan's government, as well as some firms and companies and some private contributors," he says. Almost 1.3 billion Yen was collected within a very short time, paying for about 30 kinds of medicine and food products. The Soviet Red Cross society helped work out a schedule for delivering and distributing aid.

The cargo will be delivered by planes from Niigata to Khabarovsk and by marine vessels to the ports of the maritime region and to Sakhalin. "We see our moral duty in supporting our neighbors during this difficult time. The Soviet Union helped Japan by sending the necessary amount of vaccine during a poliomyelitis epidemic," said Hiraide.

South Korean TV Sets Assembled in Tokmak

PM1906152191 Moscow Central Television Vostok Program and Orbita Networks in Russian 1530 GMT 17 Jun 91

[From the "Vremya" newscast: Report by V. Fedorov, identified by caption]

[Text] [Announcer] And now something new for television viewers. Our country ranks fourth in the world in terms of the production of television sets after China, Japan, and the United States. But as regards quality, here we are inferior to many and primarily to Japan and South Korea. In Bishkek they have developed the first model of a television in conjunction with South Korea. Perhaps it is destined to become the model of the future.

[Fedorov] Goldstar. Yes, that is the brand name of the very large Korean firm which is on the television sets of the first consignment produced in Tokmak at a joint Kyrgyz-Korean venture. It looks as though the small city in the center of Chuy Oblast will soon become an electronics landmark. By the end of the year they will produce 60,000 television sets here and not only of with screens of 37 cm but also wide-screen 54 cm or 69 cm sets. In 1995 they will increase production to 0.5 million sets and later to 1 million sets a year. So far only the assembly is done here. Components, units, and the technology come from the foreign partner. He acts as the guarantor of the high quality of the output and its competitiveness and not only on the Soviet market. The receiver has a remote-control high-definition picture. Its price is still being discussed, but it is already clear that not everyone will be able to afford it: It will cost only slightly less than the annual salary of a Kyrgyz minister. Actually, it is possible the market will amend that.

[Kyrgyzstan President A. Akayev] We have begun radical structural transformations in our economy. We would like to switch to the ranks of the commodity-producing republics and I think this is the first determined step in this direction.

[A. Dzhumagulov, chairman of the Chuy Oblast Soviet of People's Deputies] In the very near future we will produce microwave cookers. In the long term there will be tape recorders...

[Kyrgyz Premier N. Isanov] These are the first steps taken by the republic in the foreign economic field. I think this is the main path for finding a way out of the difficult economic situation in our republic.

[Fedorov] Answering a question about whether Goldstar does not fear for its brand name because of the goods produced in Tokmak, the firm's president (Li Khun Dzho) replied: No. But he added:

[Li Khun Dzho] Although the quality is up to world standard, with such bright sunshine it should not be left on the street for long.

East Europe

Last Soviet Troops Withdraw From CSFR

LD1906013691 Prague CTK in English 1719 GMT 18 Jun 91

[Text] Prague June 18 (CTK)—The last Soviet troop train, carrying military equipment as well as 917 Soviet soldiers and 83 family members, is due to leave Milovice, central Bohemia, formerly the largest Soviet Army base in Czechoslovakia, on Wednesday, a member of the Czechoslovak parliamentary commission in charge of the Soviet troop withdrawal told CTK today. Petr Brodsky said there were 73,500 military servicemen, 18,500 officers and 44,340 civilian workers and dependants in Czechoslovakia at the end of February 1990 when Soviet troops began withdrawing. Brodsky described the conduct of representatives of the Soviet command as very constructive, thanks to which the withdrawal took place without any great problems. He said the last Soviet military representative, General Eduard Vorobyev, is expected to leave for the Soviet Union on June 26, one day after a protocol on the definitive departure of Soviet troops from Czechoslovakia is scheduled to be signed. The whole 23- year chapter of the Soviet occupation of Czechoslovakia is expected to be closed by a session of the Czechoslovak Federal Assembly (parliament) on June 30, 1991, which will declare null and void the 1968 agreement on the "temporary" stay of Soviet troops in Czechoslovakia. Brodsky suggested that the Federal Assembly declare June 30 as Czechoslovakia's commemorative day.

Further on Withdrawal

LD1906221191 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 19 Jun 91

[From the "Vremya" newscast; video report by correspondent S. Andreyev in Prague]

[Excerpt] The withdrawal of Soviet troops from two Eastern European countries, Hungary and Czechoslovakia, is nearing completion. We have received a report from Prague.

[Andreyev] The last units which guarded the property of the Central Group of Forces and transferred it to the Czechoslovak Army's care are leaving today. Combat equipment was sent home long ago, that is 1,260 tanks, 2,505 infantry vehicles, 1.218 artillery guns, 77 aircraft and 146 helicopters. The Central Group of Forces stationed in Czechoslovakia numbered 73,500 people. A most complex operation which has proceeded strictly in accordance with schedule, in a well-organized and worthy manner, is drawing to a close. Individual incidents do not count. Judging by press-publications, our Czechoslovak colleagues, journalists, have understood this, too. Today they surrounded Colonel-General Vorobyev, commander of the Central Group of Forces. They spoke about constructing new relations between our countries and about how to use the structures left after the withdrawal. A Soviet-Czechoslovak intergovernment agreement on settling property and financial issues related to the withdrawal of troops will be signed soon. [passage omitted] [video shows trucks on open railway cars; journalists talking to Vorobyev]

Gorbachev Role in Prague Session 'Not Yet Clear'

LD1906153491 Budapest MTI in English 1319 GMT 19 Jun 91

[Text] Prague, June 19 (MTI)—It remains to be seen whether Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev will take part in the last session of the Political Consultative Committee [PCC] of the Warsaw Treaty in Prague on July 1. This is why Czechoslovakian President Vaclav Havel said on Tuesday that it was not yet clear as to who exactly would be taking part in the conference, diplomatic sources said in Prague.

According to the sources, for home policy reasons it would be inconvenient for the Soviet president personally to 'assist' at the final and formal demolition of the one-time empire's European pillar. For this reason, it is conceivable that the last session of the WTO [Warsaw Treaty Organization] PCC will be held at a prime ministerial level, the diplomatic sources said.

Health Ministry Ignorant of Todorov Whereabouts

PM2006095591 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 19 Jun 91 p 1

[Item in roundup of RIA, URAL-AKTSEPT, TASS, and ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA reports: "The Health Ministry Does not Know, See, or Hear"]

[Text] A senior official of the USSR Ministry of Health was unable to tell RIA's correspondent anything definite about the supposed presence of General Vladimir Todorov, former head of the intelligence service of the Bulgarian Ministry of Internal Affairs, in the Soviet Union for treatment. However, the possibility that Todorov has come to the USSR for "medical observation" without the knowledge of the Ministry of Health cannot be ruled out. "The case of Honecker has shown that we are notified of such things only after the event," he remarked. Let us recall that Gen. Todorov was accused by the Bulgarian authorities of complicity in the destruction of the file on the involvement of the Bulgarian special services in the assassination of the well-known dissident writer Georgi Markov in 1978.

West Europe

Delors Arrives in Moscow To Discuss Aid

LD1906170791 Moscow TASS in English 1635 GMT 19 Jun 91

[By diplomatic correspondent Leonid Timofeyev]

[Text] Moscow June 19 TASS—Chairman of the Commission of the European Communities Jacques Delors arrived in Moscow today as a guest of the Soviet Government.

On the same day he would hold talks with Soviet Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov, his deputy Vladimir Shcherbakov and Member of the Security Council Yevgeniy Primakov.

On Thursday Delors is expected to meet Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev.

At his talks with the top Soviet leadership and members of the Cabinet of Ministers Delors is expected to discuss relations between the Soviet Union and the European Communities, a number of international problems, including security and cooperation issues.

Speaking to TASS on his arrival in Moscow, Delors said he came to the Soviet Union to extend relations between the European Communities and the USSR. The point at issue, he said, is food and technical assistance to the Soviet Union.

He noted that the Common Market is the world's only group of states that decided to give the Soviet Union collective aid. Delors is also interested in the pace of reform in the Soviet Union. The economic reform must be preceded by the reform of state institutions, he said.

Meets With Pavlov, Primakov

LD1906223791 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 2112 GMT 19 Jun 91

[From the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] It seems that, the more often we meet you, the heavier your briefcase gets. Those were the words with which Prime Minister Pavlov began his meeting with Delors, president of the EC Commission.

Some of the things in Delors' briefcase are already known. He has stated that he came with the intention of deepening relations between the EC and technical aid to the Soviet Union [sentence as heard].

Delors also had talks with Primakov, member of the security council. Tomorrow he is scheduled to have a meeting with President Gorbachev.

Gorbachev Airs Issues with Greek Party Leader

LD1906185191 Moscow TASS in English 1843 GMT 19 Jun 91

[Text] Moscow June 19 TASS—Mikhail Gorbachev today met General Secretary of the Greek Communist Party Central Committee Aleksandra Papariga.

Gorbachev and Papariga discussed the principled issues of reform in the Soviet Union. By and large, Gorbachev stressed, it marks the first time in the 1,000-year history of the huge country that the long-overdue transformations have been carried out within a peaceful democratic framework. This does not come easy, he said.

The fundamental condition of overcoming difficulties and continuing transformations is attaining an accord on what appears to be the main thing: the need to strengthen legality, to observe human rights, to avoid the whipping up of political, inter-ethnic and social conflicts. It is high time that everyone realised that people cannot be herded into a new life with force, that the fates of whole nations cannot be tailored to fit the abstract schemes and models.

At the same time, it is exceptionally important to comprehensively consider the major changes that occur in the fundamentals of the modern civilisation throughout the world. The lack of a good theory enabling the adequate and extensive view of life is a luxury that respectable political parties, left-wing and progressive movements especially, cannot afford. It is impossible either to map out the genuine practical approaches to solving the urgent problems of individual countries, in isolation from the integration processes and real prospects worldwide.

The interlocutors favoured developing traditional Soviet-Greek cooperation for the benefit of stronger international stability and fruitful continuation of the European process.

Gorbachev Greets Swiss President on Anniversary

PM1906142591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Jun 91 Second Edition p 4

[Message of greetings from USSR President M. Gorbachev to Swiss President F. Cotti on Switzerland's 700th anniversary; date of message not given]

Esteemed Mr. President, on behalf of the Soviet leadership and people I send you, the Swiss Federal Council, and the Swiss people warmest congratulations on Switzerland's 700th anniversary.

The path followed by Swiss society over the past seven centuries is part and parcel of the history and experience of European and world civilization. With admirable consistency, doggedness, and industry the Swiss people have successfully laid the foundations for the present federal state. It is no accident that peaceful coexistence on the basis of mutual respect and tolerance by people speaking different languages, having different faiths, and holding different political views is attracting the earnest attention of other countries and peoples. During these centuries a high level of material and spiritual culture has been attained, combining elements of advanced achievements of civilization and centuries-old national traditions.

Switzerland introduced to world politics and diplomacy such concepts and realities as permanent neutrality, good offices, mediation, and solidarity. Many states, including the Soviet Union, have gratefully availed themselves and continue to avail themselves of the hospitality and superb facilities provided by Switzerland for the holding of international and bilateral conferences, meetings, and negotiations that are important for the fate of Europe and the entire world. The "spirit of Geneva" and the "spirit of Switzerland" are a symbol of the practical implementation of the ideas of mutual understanding and cooperation aimed at solving the most vexed problems of the day.

Russia and the Soviet Union are tied to Switzerland by bonds of respect, friendship, and mutual cultural interchange. Cooperation is developing actively in the political, trade, economic, scientific, and cultural spheres. Human contacts too are expanding and growing stronger, which is particularly important. Consistently traveling the path of the renewal of the Soviet federation, we have repeatedly looked to the unique and instructive Swiss experience, and will continue to do so. I am sure that our good relations will grow stronger with every passing year and be filled with new content.

Permit me, esteemed Mr. President, to wish you, the Federal Council, and the entire Swiss people happiness, peace, and prosperity.

[Signed] M. Gorbachev, USSR president

Lukyanov Cited on London Impressions, G-7 Hopes

PM1906104591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
18 Jun 91 Second Edition p 5

[Interview with A.I. Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, in London 17 June by PRAVDA correspondent A. Lyutyy; first two paragraphs are introduction: "The World's Parliaments Have Some Similarities. A.I. Lukyanov, USSR Supreme Soviet Chairman, Speaks"]

[Text] A.I. Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, has completed a four-day official visit to Britain. He was here at the invitation of the leadership of the House of Commons. It is quite natural that the trip by the supreme representative of the USSR legislature was above all a parliamentary trip: He had meetings with leaders of both chambers at Westminster, with representatives of all political factions, and with the British group of the Interparliamentary Union.

What made the greatest impression on him in the work at Westminster?

[Lukyanov] I was most struck by the similarity of parliaments in various countries. Speakers everywhere probably have to remind parliamentarians every time that a clash of opinions is a clash of minds, rather than skulls. There was also a great deal that was instructive: For instance, the work of Britain's parliamentary committees, the control over government activity, and the way in which legislative documents are improved as they undergo their readings.

[Lyutyy] What could the British find useful in the Supreme Soviet's practical work?

[Lukyanov] It's hard to tell what could be useful, but I know that they are very interested in the activity of our factions and groups—and there are 23 of them in the Supreme Soviet. They are interested in our system of communicating with voters, the procedure for examining their statements, letters, appeals, and complaints. Our British colleagues are also interested in the way that the speaker—in our case the chairman of the Soviet parliament—takes part in the debates and does not merely call deputies to order by shouting "Order!", as is the case here. Somewhere in the midst of these traditions a truth can most probably be found. [Lukyanov ends]

During his visit A.I. Lukyanov met with Prime Minister John Major and Foreign Secretary D. Hurd. Naturally, talk turned to the preparations for the G-7 conference in London. In response to a question from a British correspondent at a press conference as to whether the Soviet guest had heard anything fundamentally new as regards the West's plans for aid to the USSR, the chairman of the Supreme Soviet replied:

[Lukyanov] I cannot tell you anything totally new. Yes, strictly speaking, we never expected anyone to give us anything for nothing just for love. But there is understanding of our problems. They are prepared to cooperate with us in implementing real programs. The USSR is seriously seen as a power with a tremendous influence on processes in Europe, and people want to see our country as a strong, unified state which contributes to stabilizing the situation in the world.

CPSU's Falin Appraises WW II Conference

PM1906115191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
17 Jun 91 Second Edition p 5

[Report by correspondent Ye. Grigoriyev report under the "Our Interview" rubric, incorporating statement by V.M. Falin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, in Bonn; no date of interview specified: "Drawing a Line Beneath the Past"]

[Text] Bonn, 16 Jun—An international scientific symposium, timed to coincide with the 50th anniversary of the attack by Hitler's Germany against the Soviet Union, ended here today. Taking part in it were historians and political scientists from seven countries, including the FRG, the United States, Britain, and the Soviet Union. One of the main reports at the symposium, held in Bad

Godesberg's "Redoutenhalle," was delivered by V.M. Falin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. Your correspondent asked him to share his impressions from the work and results of the four-day debate.

A formal pretext for holding the symposium, V.M. Falin said, was provided by the discovery in the Soviet Union and Germany of a large quantity of new documents concerning the activity of German Ambassador Werner von Schulenberg and the role played by individual German diplomats in the reaching of accords between Berlin and Moscow in 1939, and the subsequent attempts by those diplomats to prevent Nazi Germany's aggression against the USSR. Naturally, the symposium is geared to the 50th anniversary of the sad date of 22 June 1941, which marked the beginning of the Great Patriotic War. Just before that date, there appeared a mass of speculations and forgeries attempting to rewrite history and produce arguments to somehow justify the aggression or reduce the Nazi regime's responsibility for what happened. Therefore, the basic criterion for symposium participants was the readiness to substantiate any point of view not by suppositions and hypotheses but by documents and facts.

The symposium demonstrated, first, the inconsistency of attempts to turn events upside down and to subordinate their explanation and appraisal to the current tasks of certain contemporary concepts and actions. In order to justify any demands made of the Soviet Union, it is necessary to change the view of decisive historical episodes of the prewar and war years. The revision does not begin by raising doubts about the war's outcome, it begins by reviewing the sources of war.

Second, the symposium demonstrated that there remains a large quantity of blank spots, without whose elimination we will be unable to acquire a comprehensive idea about the occurrence of many phenomena and the causal link between them.

The third important conclusion comprises the fact that many countries have a sufficiently serious scientific potential which is prepared to honestly and objectively tackle for the first time the writing of history not by one against another but by one with another for truth's sake, utilizing the opportunities provided both by the new relations between states and by the declassification of some very important archive documents.

As regards the symposium's topical political importance and the broad examination of historical problems through the prism of the 50th anniversary of the start of the war on the Eastern Front, this is part of the cleansing of our relations primarily with Germany. It is necessary in order to build the all-European home, the legal, cultural, and human space in Europe. It will relieve our future from the burden we are carrying over from the past. We must draw a line beneath the past, call everything by its proper name, explain to ourselves and to each other why events developed as they did and why it was that numerous opportunities to avert the tragedy were missed at that complex time. This is necessary for the main conclusion: Nothing like that should recur ever again.

Oleynik Hails 'Useful' Meeting on Nations

PM1906143191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
14 Jun 91 Second Edition p 4

[Report by correspondent V. Peresada: "Slogan Is Good-Neighborliness. Future of International Relations in Tomorrow's Europe"]

[Excerpts] Ghent, 13 Jun—In this ancient city of Flanders, the cradle of the 17th-century national-liberation movement, an international conference has been held on the unusual subject of "The Future of Nations in Greater Europe." Taking part in it were the leaders of Belgium's Flemish and Walloon communities, members of the government, academics, and representatives of local and foreign social organizations, including a delegation from the Soviet Committee for European Security and Cooperation. [passage omitted]

None of the speakers overlooked the current situation in the Soviet Union. The general theme of the speeches was that it is necessary to rapidly settle interethnic conflicts on the basis of reorganizing [pereustroystvo] but preserving the unified state. There was special interest at the conference in the speech by B. Oleynik, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities and head of our delegation, who talked about the tasks of renewing the Soviet federation.

"This meeting has been very useful," B. Oleynik said in an interview with this PRAVDA correspondent. "Not least from the standpoint of familiarizing ourselves with foreign experience. I think that we will need to take a closer look at how nationalities problems are resolved in certain West European countries—Belgium, for instance—and at the ideas of organizing a federal union of the 12 'Common Market' states. As for the West's approach to our affairs, people here realize—as the conference has shown—that without national state stability in the Soviet Union there can be neither an all-European home nor lasting security for West Europe itself."

Report on Links With European Energy Charter

OW2006043991 Moscow INTERFAX in English
1200 GMT 19 Jun 91

[From "Business Today"; following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Dutch prime minister, Mr. Ruud Lubbers, was the first to suggest the idea of European Energy Community, and early this year, the EC submitted the draft of a European Energy Charter, which will be discussed by a high level meeting of experts in Brussels in mid-July.

Apart from collaboration in the energy sector, the charter calls for more efficient utilization of energy and for upgrading safety precautions regarding nuclear energy, as well as for increasing the supply of petroleum and gas. It also calls for a unification of power systems and aims to utilize the EEC's experience to strengthen economic cooperation between Western and Eastern Europe. As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, the project provides a unique opportunity for its integration within the world economy and its movement towards a market economy.

There are two principal reasons why such moves should start with the energy sector.

First of all, the energy sector, as a whole, is the only branch of the Soviet economy whose output (electric power, petroleum, gas, coal etc.) can easily be sold on the world market. Therefore, it is one of the few fields in which in would be possible to collaborate on an equal and wide scale basis with the Western countries. Through this collaboration, a trading and economic, as well as political and legal, ftamework for a market economy will emerge.

Secondly, the energy sector is unique as to the role it plays in the Soviet economy since it is the moving force for the country's economy growth. The energy sector not only serves as a base for many other forms of industrial activity, but itself is a very large consumer of material and financial resources.

Thererfore, it would be quite natural that, if moves are made to bring the USSR's energy sector into alignment with the technical, technoloigcal, legal, and ecological standards of the West European energy sector, other sectors of the economy would be dragged along with it. Thus, it is through the energy sector that the first large linkage of the Soviet economy with the European and world economies can be achieved.

In order to implement the goals of the charter, which envisage a free market for energy, wide accessibility to modern technology and a homogeneous legal environment within the European framework, the Soviet Union will nevertheless need assistance from the Western countries in such fields as legislation, technology, and creating an appropriate infrastructure.

Finnish Forestry Experts Work in North Russia

OW2006080791 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1200 GMT 19 Jun 91

[From "Business Today"; following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] In a joint effort with Soviet experts, the Finnish firm Yaako Poyry is working on a programme named "Forestry Complex" designed to stimulate the development of forestry in the north European regions of the USSR.

According to Vladimir Makrov who is in charge of the Soviet end of the project, the programme provides for examining the present state and prospects for the development of forestries in the north of Russia. It also includes plans for the setting up of joint ventures to develop forest resources with the participation of Finnish, Swedish, and German firms.

In an interview to the "DELOVOI MIR" newspaper, Valeriy Makarov said that at the proposal of Finnish partners special emphasis will be placed on creating small-scale enterprises in the paper industry and forestry-oriented machine building.

The Finnish partners will be responsible for obtaining credits to finance the projects.

First Shipment of EC Humanitarian Aid Arrives

LD1906093191 Moscow TASS in English 2147 GMT 18 Jun 91

[By correspondents Eleonora Sutotskaya]

[Text] Moscow June 19 TASS—The first humanitarian aid shipment of 40 tonnes of powdered milk and baby food from European communities to the Soviet Union has been flown to Moscow on Tuesday. The goods will be conveyed to hospitals, orphanages and families with many children.

"This marks the beginning of a large-scale humanitarian action to deliver 105,000 tonnes of food, worth 250 million European Currency Units (ECU) to the Soviet Union before the year end," Ambassador Michael Emerson of the Commission of European Communities in the USSR told journalists. "A convoy of trucks with parcels is now on the way to Moscow".

The Soviet side supplied the colleagues with a list of hospitals, orphanages, social insurance organisations, the names of old, disabled and lonely people needing care and attention. Aid will be distributed with the approval of all participants in the action. In accordance with their consent, the first shipment will go to inhabitants of Moscow region.

Michael Emerson on Tuesday took baby food parcels to the boarding house for deaf children in the small town of Reutov outside Moscow. Three-year-old toddlers pressed their little hands against their hearts to thank the benefactors.

Other trucks went to Balashikha, Kolomna and Orekhovo-Zuyevo escorted by Red Cross activists.

Further shipments of baby food, meant preserves and powder milk arriving in the Soviet Union will go to inhabitants of Moscow, Leningrad, Kiev, Minsk and the Caucasian republics. They will also be sent to zones affected by the Chernobyl blast.

In accordance with the decision by the European Community and the Soviet leadership, the charitable action, including the delivery and distribution of goods, will be monitored by Soviet and German Red Cross societies.

Supreme Soviet

PRAVDA Reports Pavlov 17 Jun Speech

PM1806134991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Jun 91 Second Edition pp 1-2

[Report by V. Rostovtsev and Ye. Sorokin under the rubric "At the USSR Supreme Soviet Session": "Salvation in Close Cooperation"]

[Text] V. Pavlov, chairman of the USSR Cabinet of Ministers, provided more extensive information yesterday on the socioeconomic and sociopolitical situation in the country at a plenary sitting of both houses of parliament. This is the premier's second speech to deputies in the past week on the most urgent problems of society's life.

The premier began by noting: Today it can be said with confidence that our people have in the main realized the historical inevitability of the transformations that are taking place and advocate further real movement toward democratization and glasnost, a diversity of forms of ownership, and extensive economic freedom for regions, labor collectives, and each individual. At the same time, it would be premature to talk about civic consensus regarding ways of achieving these ends. Society is now deeply split ideologically and is excessively politicized. The clarification of relations between parties, sociopolitical organizations and movements, and individual republics has clearly been dragging on. In this situation the government considers its prime duty to be to focus its efforts on resolving all the key tasks on which the state, economic, and even physical survival of our people and country as a whole directly depend.

He went on to ask questions which, in his words, are of concern to everyone: Where is the country? How effective are the measures being taken by its president, Supreme Soviet, Cabinet of Ministers, and by republic governments? Answering these questions, he recalled that in the first three years of the five-year plan, including 1988, there had been a rise in the economy, albeit slight. In 1990, for the first time in many years, production fell—by 1.2 percent. Above all, this drop affected basic sectors of the economy.

Production also fell in agriculture. The area sown to grain fell by millions of hectares, and cattle, pig, and sheep numbers fell by millions. As a result, overall purchases of the main types of agricultural products fell in 1990 compared with the previous year. This included a 25-percent drop for potatoes, a 20-percent drop for sugar beet, and an 18-percent drop for sunflowers. And production of foodstuffs fell as a result.

The fall in production in the city and the countryside, V. Pavlov continued, has brought about an abrupt deterioration in the position in the consumer market. The target set for 1990 of boosting consumer goods production by 66 billion rubles [R] fell short by R26 billion. To this the premier added the antialcohol campaign, which has lost the state some R200 billion in revenue as a whole. Unfortunately, nobody has explained to the people that all this would inevitably be followed by a sharp drop in living standards. The delaying of the crisis through the use of foreign loans could not and has not solved the problem, since it did not affect the actual foundations of the economy. It has merely tightened the noose of the crisis.

The national economy has been very hard hit by strikes. Above all, strikes by the miners, who have been making both economic and political demands. In March and April these strikes—taking account of the reduced production in related sectors—resulted in output worth around R18 billion being lost. In V. Pavlov's opinion, strikes are a normal phenomenon under the conditions of market relations. However, he is convinced that such conflicts should be resolved on a clear-cut legal basis through the adoption and unconditional fulfillment of commitments by both sides.

[Text] Some people see a way out in transferring these mines to the jurisdiction of union republics. But this, the premier said, is quite wrong. At those Kuzbass mines which switched to Russian "protection," for instance, coal production fell.

Here we will make a small digression. The transition to republic jurisdiction now underway by enterprises belonging to the Union is a difficult process. Very often the new "boss" promises the collectives at such enterprises a "gold mine": reduced profit deductions and a number of social privileges. Where will the funds for this come from? After all, under the new Union Treaty as soon as the final division of powers between the treaty components takes place, republic governments will have to solve this problem themselves. They will no longer be able to leave everything to the center.

Of course, V. Pavlov admitted, the Cabinet has not been able to achieve a fundamental breakthrough for the better in five months of work, and probably this could not have been expected in such a short period, given the acuteness of the situation. At the same time, in his opinion, certain trends have already emerged and clear signs have appeared of an incipient move toward socioeconomic and political stabilization.

Continuing the speech, the premier said that the country has entered a critical phase of development. The next few months will decide everything: Either we will really master the situation in the economy and society as a whole, and start the process of stabilizing the national economy, or we can expect a complete collapse. The Cabinet of Ministers has implemented the necessary contacts and collaboration with all republic governments. It is an encouraging sign that, since April, the range of difficulties in relations between the center and Russia and its leaders has noticeably narrowed, even though a number of serious problems—particularly in the budget and finance sphere—remain. The Union government proceeds on the basis that progress in the work on the Union Treaty and the agreement of the Russian Government to sign a program on getting out of the crisis is laying the prerequisites for organizing this constructive cooperation. At any rate, there will be no obstacles as far as the center is concerned, since it does not differ with Russia on the main point—we are all in favor of the transition to market relations and the preservation of a Union of sovereign republics with clearly defined powers.

Moving to social problems, the premier gave an assurance that the country's government has highlighted the task of ensuring a normal living standard, which has fallen over the past year, for the population. Not, as had been planned, 85 percent of the difference between new and old retail prices, but the full 100 percent has been used to compensate for the population's [increased] expenditure in connection with the price increases.

The government considers it its duty to step up social protection for all sectors of the population—above all, those who are particularly vulnerable under the conditions of transition to the market. A package of proposals is being prepared on the comprehensive resolution of young people's socioeconomic problems, and practical steps are being taken to ensure the population's employment. The government committee on women's affairs has elaborated and submitted to parliament the foundations of state policy on improving the position of women and the family, and on protecting mother and child.

The viability of all these plans is determined by the processes which are taking place not only in the production sphere, but in the financial sphere too. The overall assessment attests to a profound financial, credit, and monetary imbalance in the national economy.

A number of republics have adopted decisions which in practice contravene Union legislation and the economic agreement as regards the distribution of income between budgets. Thus, currently the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] is not transmitting the profits tax to the Union budget, the Ukrainian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] and the republics of Georgia and Moldova are not transmitting fixed sums for statewide spending to the Union budget. The Uzbek and Kazakh SSR's have decided to transmit all spending to their republic budgets. The Baltic republics are not taking part in drawing up Union budget income.

Given the exceptionally complex position over the execution of the Union budget, the Soviet Government has introduced restrictions on the financing of virtually all kinds of spending.

In V. Pavlov's opinion, one of the most vital and acute issues today is denationalization and privatization. Any delay in this area will have pernicious consequences. After all, in practice these processes have already begun in the country. But because of the lack of any clear-cut, developed legal basis they are nearly always proceeding randomly. In some places small-scale privatization is under way, in other areas large-scale privatization is happening, in some places both kinds are occurring, and in still other places the authorities are not allowing any privatization at all.

The program of joint actions by the USSR Cabinet of Ministers and the sovereign republic governments contains entirely specific proposals: to set up a conciliation commission to streamline legislation on denationalization and privatization; to abolish a number of Union and republic normative acts which contradict each other; and then to distribute jurisdiction regarding enterprises between the republics and the Union within the limits of their powers. This needs to be done in order to avoid two possible extremes whereby privatization turns into random seizure or redistribution of property. Or whereby it becomes total, akin to a new form of collectivization being implemented under pressure from above and without taking account of the views and interests of labor collectives or of society's interests.

World experience shows that this gradual and protracted process should clearly be started with small-scale privatization—that is, with the privatization of enterprises in the trading system, public catering, the services sphere, part of the construction industry, and small industrial enterprises. As for so-called large-scale privatization, it should implemented in a balanced and comprehensive fashion.

The premier then dwelled on the state of foreign economic ties. The situation here is unambiguous. The state monopoly in foreign trade has been dismantled. Almost 30,000 Soviet enterprises are engaged in foreign operations. We have opened up the domestic market to foreign investment. Around 3,000 joint enterprises have been set up. At the same time, there has been a clear drop in foreign trade turnover—by almost one-third compared with last year. A considerable foreign debt has built up, although it has fallen somewhat since the start of the year. Imports have mainly been of consumer goods.

The government's anticrisis program plans to substantially simplify export licensing and to begin insuring the commercial risks of participants in foreign economic ties. It is striving to restore production and cooperation [kooperatsionnyy] exchange with the CEMA countries, where this is economically advantageous. An investment committee has been set up to attract foreign investment to the country and protect it. Our economy will be shaped not just as a market economy, but as an open economy developing in conjunction and in competition with the world economy.

A radical step on the path to this will be domestic ruble convertibility, planned for introduction in 1992. Based on the experience of the East European countries, it will make exports more attractive and profitable, bring domestic prices more into line with world prices, and unify the economic accountability of enterprises' foreign and domestic operations. It is also necessary to take major steps to attract foreign funds to the country. The main channel for the long term should be foreign investment flowing directly into production and not increasing state external debt.

The government sees one of its most important tasks as being to clearly organize the work to compile production programs and forecasts for the socioeconomic development of enterprises, regions, republics, and the Union as a whole for 1992 under the conditions of the formation of market relations. The publication in yesterday's PRAVDA of a resolution from the country's Cabinet of Ministers was devoted to this.

In connection with the complex situation, the main speaker noted, the government should possess the appropriate powers. Does the Cabinet of Ministers have such rights at the moment? Unfortunately, it has no right of legislative initiative and often lacks any opportunity to urgently resolve any highly acute matters that may arise, without the agreement either of the Supreme Soviet, the president, the republics, or local organs—even enterprises.

The second problem is work on the 1992 program. It lays down a fundamentally new approach to drawing up state orders and the budget. Enterprises should be immediately involved in this work, without waiting for the adoption of relevant laws—which may only be published at the end of the year. Because time may once again be lost—as has already happened with the plan for the current year.

The next problem is linked with the normalization of the financial system. If the implementation of a genuinely unified, agreed policy in this sphere is not ensured, the country will inevitably slide into an inflationary spiral in the next few months, with all its very serious consequences for the population. The government can see this danger and knows how to avert it. But, to do this, it needs powers connected with a swift reaction to the situation.

The granting of such powers does not mean that the Cabinet of Ministers is getting out of the control of organs of legislative or presidential power. At the same time, it will increase its mobility and effectiveness.

After questions were answered the debate began. The tone was set by Deputy V. Kucherenko. He noted that the country is expecting changes, but has been deluged with laws. The speaker called on people not to count on foreign economic aid, but to rely above all on their own abilities. V. Kucherenko noted that a single economic space is being destroyed on the pretext of the republics' struggle for sovereignty.

Deputy V. Vologzhin said that the fall in production has been halted. This, in his opinion, was particularly a result of the ending of confrontation between political forces and strikes. At the same time, he drew attention to the fact that a number of republics have adopted laws which prevent the normal movement of goods and destroy the single economic space.

Deputies E. Kugasov and Yu. Sharipov, who then spoke, also supported the idea of granting the government additional powers and noted the need for the speedy and effective implementation of the government's program for getting out of the crisis.

Talking about the deputies' reaction to Prime Minister V. Pavlov's speech, we would like to note that they shared most of his positions. At the same time, just as was the case after his previous speech, the parliamentarians were guarded about the excessive and not always justified optimism and the clear lack of self-criticism. Sharing this opinion, we are hopeful that the government will nonetheless abandon its old habits and be as objective as possible in its statements and actions.

'Vesti' Views Pavlov Power Bid

LD1906223691 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 2006 GMT 19 Jun 91

[Commentary by Sergey Dorenko—from the "Vesti" newscast]

[Text] In January Gorbachev presented Valentin Pavlov to the Soviet parliament as a man of character. The premier's character became noticeable when with the sangfroid of a laboratory technician preparing frogs, he explained the advantage of withdrawing large denomination banknotes and told the country that the striking miners were being led by provocateurs. But his field of activities outlined by the law seemed to him to be too narrow, and now the premier is trying to obtain practically presidential powers from the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Gorbachev has disappointed the conservatives. He is forcing the creation of a new union in Novo-Ogarevo, and is seeking compromises with the now strong republics. But in the new union the party administrative nomenklatura is unwanted. And the present union deputies will be sent off to their homes. Republican leaders do not agree on less. Gorbachev in Novo-Ogarevo is not betraying his own, but just realistically evaluating the balance of forces, and trying to save central power as such.

The conservatives are not satisfied. Speeches are again being heard in the union parliament about counterrevolution and a coincidence between the democrats' policies and U.S. espionage. And now the culmination. Premier Pavlov is demanding that he be given the powers of the president, even additional powers. According to certain information his demands were supported at the closed session by Kryuchkov, Pugo and Yazov. Moreover the draft resolution talks not only of the economy, but also of the country's social and political life. The resolution did not pass the assembly. Gorbachev asked that the issue be postponed until Friday, and is getting ready for battle. And if the conservatives are able to remove Gorbachev from things, then the fragile political stability, the creation of a new union and the sovereignty of the republics will be placed in doubt.

But it is not easy for Gorbachev to show the failure complex. His main virtue and shortcoming is his tendency to maneuver. Most likely he will try to lull the vigilance of the conservatives in the Supreme Soviet with long speeches on socialist choice, while he will lean on the leaders of the republic in constructing the new union.

The details will be in Russian Television's "Vesti" on Friday.

Deputy Urges More Powers for Prime Minister

LD1806222491 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1709 GMT 18 Jun 91

[Statement by "Soyuz" Deputy Blokhin at USSR Supreme Soviet session in Moscow on 18 June; from the "Parliamentary Diary" program—recorded]

[Text] In the current situation, it is essential as never before to take the most rapid and resolute measures for the Union state structures of power to react executively to current problems. Our prime minister has the will for this, and the desire to work, to act, of which he has spoken on several occasions at sessions of the USSR Supreme Soviet. And there can be no doubt about supporting him, about investing him with powers within the range of powers of the USSR Supreme Soviet concerning the executive administration of the country; and, in particular, concerning the adoption of resolute measures for taking in this year's harvest, normalizing the financial and monetary-credit system, creating a centralized taxation system including a single tax inspectorate for the whole country, strengthening the organs fighting organized crime, and so on.

The Supreme Soviet, as the country's supreme legislative and supervisory organ of state power between USSR Congresses of People's Deputies, is empowered to make such a decision. It is constitutional, in any case; you won't find in the constitution that the Supreme Soviet cannot make such a decision.

In the case in question, the provisional transfer, say, until the end of this year of powers for the executive running of the country will be adequate to the situation and will contribute to strengthening executive powers in the country, both overall and in the localities. We have a precedent: the USSR Supreme Soviet resolution on additional measures to stabilize the country's economic and socio-political life, where, for the purpose of stabilizing the situation in the country, additional rights have already been given to the USSR president for normative acts and instructions on an executive basis. But life has shown that, due to the USSR president's huge workload, he does not always manage to act executively. The president's decrees lag behind life.

IZVESTIYA Reports Debate on Gorbachev Powers

PM2006092691 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 20 Jun 91 Union Edition pp 1-2

[Report by parliamentary correspondents A. Stepovoy, S. Chugayev on 18 June USSR Supreme Soviet proceedings: "Superpower Nostalgia"]

[Text] The scheduled two-day break in the plenary sittings of the Union parliament session seems to have come at just the right moment. Let us hope that during that time the deputies will manage to calm down and get back their breath, which they were getting short of in the last two days. If we said that the atmosphere in the chambers' hall of sessions on 17 and 19 June was overheated, this comparison would be a poor approximation. Because, as any dosimetrist would tell you, the deputies' emotional radiation "went off the scale" on all the measuring instruments.

In many ways the session's work on 18 June echoed the previous day's. But whereas the state of the USSR Supreme Soviet on Monday could be assessed as a kind of reaction, albeit a sensitive one, to the Novo-Ogarevo meeting, after it had become known that the Preparatory Committee for Formulating a Draft Union Treaty had finished its work the deputies' behavior becomes hard to explain. It is more likely that what had formerly not been openly advertised was coming out into the open. Sensing a real threat to their existence, a section of the body of deputies decided to confront the initiator of and participants in the Novo-Ogarevo meetings with a decisive battle, if not, perhaps, the last battle.

The strike force in the desperate offensive against the USSR president's policy was the "Soyuz" deputies' group, some of the leaders of permanent parliamentary formations, and individual deputies who describe themselves as nonaligned. And the pretext for and subject of the parliamentary dispute was premier V. Pavlov's request for his Cabinet to be vested with additional powers over the USSR president's head. It is not hard to see where this alliance between lawmakers and administrators forming a front against the "Nine Plus One" positions could lead: To a new political and constitutional crisis.

A. Lukyanov, who was in the chair in parliament on 18 June, managed to quell the deputies' passions virtually throughout the morning session. But when Deputy Yu. Blokhin, one of the "Soyuz" group's leaders, took the floor, the situation at the session became explosive again. Why? Perhaps because Yu. Blokhin, calling for the prime minister to be granted additional powers, alarmed his colleagues by speaking of their future responsibility to the people for criminal negligence and connivance with everything that is leading the country toward ruin.

The next speaker, A. Kuzmin, a representative of another deputies' group—the Interregional, also deemed the situation in the country to be an emergency, requiring exceptional solutions. But where should these be sought? The deputy rejected the "state of emergency" path, the mysterious powers that the Cabinet supposedly lacks. He sees the way out of this complex situation through the agreements already reached between republics and through the Union Treaty that is in preparation.

But this proposal does not suit the "Soyuz" group activists. And so Deputy Ye. Kogan, who mounted the rostrum soon after, was extremely frank. He began his speech with a peremptory statement: I think he (the USSR president—authors' note) has for a long time had no part in running the country. The president no longer has any right, in the deputy's view, to retain the powers we gave him. Consequently these powers should be taken away from him, if by virtue of his personal qualities he is unable to make use of them, and handed over to someone who will use these powers. Yes, Ye. Kogan agreed, of course people will refer to the Constitution and the standing orders. But, he is profoundly convinced, this is no obstacle. Here he takes as his example the Romans, who believed that necessity breaks laws.

After this, Deputy Ye. Kogan called on his colleagues to adopt a three-point decision. First: to set up a single statewide taxation service, subordinate to the USSR Supreme Soviet. Second: to deem invalid the legislative acts of republics on banks and banking activity and to instruct the USSR Gosbank [State Bank] and the USSR Cabinet of Ministers to adopt the necessary measures to implement a unified monetary and credit policy. Third: to convene an extraordinary Congress of USSR People's Deputies in July and demand a report from the president. And examine the question of the Union Treaty at the Congress.

This and the following speech, by Deputy S. Ryabchenko, were, in our view, the key points in the 18 June debates. The latter drew attention to the notes of alarm struck in the reports by V. Pavlov and three other members of his Cabinet—Kryuchkov, Pugo, and Yazov (which the press did not hear, because the sitting was closed). What did S. Ryabchenko hear? Moans, as he put it: "Our country is no longer a superpower, urgent measures are needed to restore its status." What is this, he asked—nostalgia for the past, or the abandonment of the strategy of reasonable sufficiency which we have adopted as the basis of our political course? The forces that do not support the idea of a superpower were yesterday declared to be destructive forces, and the army's departure from Eastern Europe was assessed as a defeat. But this, from S. Ryabchenko's viewpoint, is a major victory for common sense and a worthy culmination to the 1945 victory. And the fact that we have put an end to the superpower idea, that we are not now a bugaboo to frighten little children all over the world—this is also a great victory for us. Thank God we are not a superpower. And the destructive forces are those that want to turn us back onto the superpower path.

The deputy had formed the impression, in the course of the debates, that there were coordinated actions to promulgate the idea that the USSR president is incapable of using his powers, as Ye. Kogan openly stated. I cannot say the president is infallible, S. Ryabchenko noted, I myself have several times criticized some of his actions, but the attempt by right-wing forces to remove him by unconstitutional means is fraught with the risk of tragic consequences for our state.

Yes, Deputy E. Pamfilova agreed, in six years of perestroyka very many mistakes have been made. But this does not mean we are marching into an impasse. Now that objective processes have taken shape in society's development, we are once again hearing redoubled accusations against the president. Remember the situation that arose in the country last fall. The very same situation is repeating itself. Now that the president, E. Pamfilova stressed, has indeed set about implementing concrete measures, all our conservative forces are trying to remove him from office.

The reply (or maybe challenge) to this noteworthy warning came in the speech by another representative of the "Soyuz" group—Deputy A. Chekhoyev. Today, he stated, there are two real forces working for the preservation of the Union—the Supreme Soviet and the government. The president's role was denied.

The main question at the moment, Deputy K. Lubenchenko said, is political. It lies in the Union Treaty and in the creation, on this basis, of a new political structure for unifying the republics and of a new central power. He therefore understands the concern of the body of deputies, since, K. Lubenchenko is convinced, this concern is connected not only with the country's fate, but with their own fate, the fate of the apparatuses of executive power and of the leading structures of political power in the Army, the KGB, and the MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs]. The main thing, in his view, that we must do now is to discuss the draft Union Treaty, come to specific conclusions, and express our position, thinking first and foremost about preserving the territories and political and economic integrity of our country. Only in line with this can the USSR Cabinet of Ministers be endowed with additional powers.

Deputy V. Yudin shared the view of previous speakers that the main task of the country's Supreme Soviet is to ensure political stability. He condemned attempts by certain forces to deflect the USSR president from his path of implementing reforms by nonviolent methods.

Many participants in the parliamentary debates raised the question of the reasons for M. Gorbachev's absence from the session. Is he aware of the subject of the discussion? A. Lukyanov said that he had informed the president of V. Pavlov's proposals.

In response to the deputies' urgent request, USSR Vice President G. Yanayev addressed the session. He was extremely succinct: The president sees no political subtext here. And I am very worried that in some speeches an attempt has been made to represent the Cabinet of

Ministers proposal as some kind of attempted coup. Let us tackle these questions in a businesslike way, he appealed to the deputies.

More than 20 deputies spoke during the two-day debate. The debate was concluded by premier V. Pavlov, who, in his brief speech, again repeated the reasons for his appeal to the Union parliament and confirmed that his position remains unchanged.

However, at the two-day sitting no resolution was adopted on granting the government additional powers. There was only a decision to hand over all the proposals to a working party, which will summarize them and submit them to the Supreme Soviet. But V. Kucherenko, chairman of the Soviet of the Union Commission for the Budget, Plan, and Finances, expressed doubts as to the successful outcome of efforts by members of the working party.

At the end of the afternoon plenary sitting A. Lukyanov, addressing the deputies, said: Let us not give our highly esteemed and averagely esteemed press the opportunity to depict the situation as if there was some kind of split between president and government. What is happening is a normal discussion. If we now "merge" the Supreme Soviet with the government and counterpose them to the president, we could not make a better gift to the opposition and other destructive forces. Bear that in mind. And I would ask the deputies who are now—if I may say so—rushing off to give interviews, to adhere to our common position. A. Lukyanov proposed that the leaders of the KGB, MVD, and Defense Ministry answer deputies' questions on the situation in the country at a closed evening sitting. A proposal followed from Deputy S. Ryabchenko not to make it a closed sitting, since the previous closed meeting was in no way justified, and made a bad impression on the public.

Nonetheless in the evening of 18 June the press found itself—not at its own desire—freed from the business of the Union parliament. And so the score in the "closed duel"—"Novo-Ogarevo versus the Kremlin"—changed to 1:2. But who lost and who won?

Viktor Kucherenko Criticizes Yavlinskiy Plan

LD1906110791 Moscow Central Television Second Program Network in Russian 2015 GMT 17 Jun 91

[Speech by Viktor Kucherenko, chairman of the Supreme Soviet Planning and Budget Commission, at the USSR Supreme Soviet session in Moscow on 17 June—recorded]

[Text] Esteemed representative of the cabinet, the government, esteemed people's deputies: The fact is that the country finds itself in a state of a fearful expectation because its prospects are blurred in the extreme. The fact is that a torrent of laws, decisions by the Union parliament and republican parliaments which sharply change the country's and every person's way of life, has come down with a vengance upon labor collectives and the whole people. The fact is that labor collectives and the local soviets have, in practical terms, been abandoned to the vagaries of fate and thrown into the sea of these decisions. Meanwhile, those who should daily and hourly implement these decisions and assist the workforces and the soviets in getting to the bottom of these decisions are endlessly busy with elections, repeat elections, referendums and the struggle for dividing and redividing the Union. All this now requires that every people's deputy, irrespective of how much time we have left, and the Supreme Soviet, should adopt specific attitudes and tangible responsibility for the consequences of the decisions that are being made. In a situation like this, people are not receptive to the justification that we are hastily adopting the necessary laws. If things are bad in the country, people legitimately raise the question: What are you doing? That is why I want to raise several specific questions.

First, our country's foreign economic position has become extremely complicated. The debt settlement and obtaining of even short-term credits have been made incredibly more difficult by the sharp decline in exports. That is why the flippancy with which the foreign and domestic press peddles the stories about the supposed additional fabulous loans from abroad gives rise to serious concern. Who needs to divert the country from the necessity of resolving its difficulties independently, and only indpendently? The laws we adopted rely solely on our own resources and the laws we adopted concerning the involvement of foreign investments and joint enterprises rely on a mutually advantageous basis. But what about these calls: Let us take out loans, pawn half the country, we'll live two or three years, get our stomachs fed and then we'll see. Even if it is a matter of insignificant amounts of credit, it is only a very bold businessman who can extend them, given the existing political instability in the country. These would be extended for the purpose of trading. But, in my view, no one abroad is any longer interested in our country's political situation as a commodity. Yes, Russia has always attracted foreigners, both under Peter I and after him, and during the industrialization period. But it was always foreigners who worked for our country, rather than the other way round, as it is now beginning to look. The deputies from the Commission on the Budget, Planning and Finances insist that intentions with regard to this issue should be made clear.

Second, I do not understand why, as a rule, the radical economic decisions made in the country do us irreparable harm? You remember that when we were adopting decisions concerning the transition to the market, the Yavlinskiy program appeared after measures had been worked out.

The hurricane-like property privatization process it envisions—selling things to the tune of 150 to 200 billion rubles in three to four months and stabilizing the financial situation in the country—was clearly a fantasy option. We had conversations with Hungarian legislative representatives. In the space of a year and a half they privatized only one percent of trade and services. These unrealities were obvious and, naturally, the parliament rejected it at that time. However, the confidence in the government's market transition program was undermined in the country and the damage done to this complex process still manifests itself to this very day. And it remains the same now: Hardly was the anticrisis economic stabilization program adopted—and it has not yet been signed by some republican leaders—when Yavlinskiy's shadow emerged again. Again another program is presented from abroad. Underpinned by these fantasy loans, or what? As for us, we know that nothing will come out of it. However, a blow is already being struck at the confidence in the program that has been adopted through government effort. With what purpose is this being done? There are few eager volunteers in the country to implement the program, but there are legions of those who would torpedo it.

Third, in front of our very eyes and with our silence, a process of destruction of the country's single economic zone is under way. A process of destruction is under way of what the world's economists agree is one of our country's most valuable achievements over the past few decades: the in-depth economic integration in the country. Republican sovereignty is a great achievement of our young democracy, a democracy in the fullest sense of the word. However, how can one regard with equanimity the fact that individual leaders in the republics have directed all their efforts not at the growth of production, not at attaining quality of output, new machinery, not at supporting the agro-industrial complex in deed, rather than paying lip service to it, for it gives prosperity to the people, but they direct all their energy at destroying the integrated economy, massively damaging the economy in their own republics and of the Union as a whole. Unfortunately, none of this is resolutely rebuffed either by the Supreme Soviet or by the president's cabinet.

The next question: I want to criticize a bit the esteemed legal experts of our parliament, headed by Anatoliy Ivanovich [Lukyanov] who, naturally, clearly sympathizes with them. We thank our legal experts for their efforts and results in their law-making work. It is good when one article is not at loggerheads with another legal article and when everything is in its place. However, an excessive domination of the views of legal experts which, at times, is counter to common sense and the underestimation of the views of those who are aware of the consequences our decisions entail, lead at times to a lack of understanding and surprise at the local level. Let me give you an example: the fact that the Supreme Soviet succeeded, with the aid of legal niceties, in depriving the government of legislative initiative at a crucial, strike-ridden period in the country's economy, testifies to a lot, with one exception. It does not testify that common sense was present among us when this decision was being adopted. One must regard the prime minister's proposals with a great deal of attention.

The final issue: I do not now wish to dwell in detail on the state of the Union budget and the country's financial situation. We will discuss this topic when we examine the essential amendments to the budget. However, one can already note the executive authority of the country, in the shape of the president's cabinet and the Cabinet of Ministers, has failed to ensure the fulfillment of the law on the budget for 1991, adopted by the Supreme Soviet. During this time, not even half of the resources promised for the budget were forthcoming. As for the fund to stabilize branches of the economy, which is to receive about R68 billion annually, it got practically nothing. If you include the R68 billion for retail price changes—for compensating the working people who the Union budget is responsible for—and the republican assistance fund and consider that, in practical terms, the receipts are zero; well, there is a shortfall of R120 billion as far as these two items alone are concerned. But, after all, one must compensate the people; you cannot deprive them. It is, after all, necessary to ensure the finances of hundreds of millions of people who are linked to the Union budget. At the same time, republics have put into circulation these sums of resources. For this reason a fabulous annual deficit and, as a consequence, inflation, are taking shape in the country. Leaders and Supreme Soviets compete to see who will be the first and biggest donor of wealth to the people—wealth that does not exist in the country. The country has entered a new cycle of inflation. No objective conditions for this existed in the country. It was artificially organized.

Unfortunately, Mikhail Sergeyevich, our president, is not here. It is, unfortunately, first and foremost, the members of the Federation Council who played the main role in this and not the law wars. Laws are neither here nor there; it is an invented cover up. A war of leaders is under way. It is only that the man in the street finds it very hard to understand what they are fighting for. For what sake are people compelled to bear such deprivations? Speaking last time in parliament, Mikhail Sergeyevich said Kucherenko was writing letters, panic-mongering. I understand why the budget commission deputies are worried. I cannot understand why the Federation Council is calm. The Federation Council debated these issues at the beginning of April, but nothing at all has changed. The document was signed by Nine plus One, and this had a calming effect on all of us, the whole country—not a thing has changed indeed. Leaders come and go, deputies change, but the country remains and the people need to live. Why is this not being taken into account? We must demand that the Federation Council stop the country's financial chaos. They are the ones who organized it—they ought to assemble and have it resolved forthwith and there is no need to wait for the Union treaty to be signed. Thank you for your attention.

Alksnis on Accountability for Economic 'Fiasco'

LD1906112791 Moscow Central Television Second Program Network in Russian 2015 GMT 17 Jun 91

[Speech by Viktor Alksnis, Soyuz cochairman at the USSR Supreme Soviet session in Moscow on 17 June—recorded]

[Text] Who bears the blame for what is taking place in our country? The figure of some 200 billion rubles—the damage done to our country by the antialcohol campaign alone—was made public today. It must be understood that this is something that has already been written off and that there will be no one to bear the responsibility for this huge material damage done to our country.

I personally regard the president's active efforts to push through the idea of signing a Union treaty as an effort, among other things, to evade responsibility for what has taken place. This is because in this situation the old Union is disappearing and, consequently, all those, everything that is to do with these failures and miscalculations are going—but no responsibility will be brought to bear for this in the new union.

My view is that accountability is necessary. Let us honestly acknowledge that the course pursued in the last six years has ended in a complete fiasco. Specific individuals bear the blame for the fact that our country has found itself on the brink of downfall. This cannot be written off as part of Stalin's crimes, Khrushchev's arbitrariness, or Brezhnev's stagnation and morass. Today there are specific people, specific names, who are guilty of these calamities and our country's tragedy. They must be named, one by one. That is why I again hope that the Supreme Soviet should now adopt a real political line. Thank you for your attention.

Supreme Court Head on Provisions for Jury Trial

PM1906143991 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 15 Jun 91 p 1

[Report by S. Orlyuk: "Long Live the Soviet Jury Court"]

[Text] Citizens watching television the other day will no doubt have gasped in unison on hearing that if you make a really big effort you can have a trial by jury. And not just any place, but in our country.

Jury courts existed in Russia before the October Revolution. They decided one question, the main question—"guilty or not guilty." After which the final decision was made by the judge alone: He determined the punishment and so on.

Incidentally, jury courts operate in many countries. Although they only hear important cases of special public interest (between 2 and 5 percent). In our law that is crimes which can attract a sentence of over 10 years or the death penalty.

I was told this by Yevgeniy Alekseyevich Smolentsev, chairman of the USSR Supreme Court, who presented the draft Fundamentals of Criminal Procedure to the Supreme Soviet:

"When, 18 months ago, the union republics obtained the right to institute jury courts, only Azerbaijan took it up. "The problem is that it is not possible to assemble a panel of 12 jurors. Judges in major cities stand in line, waiting for people's assessors to be available! The situation has only gotten worse as a result of economic accountability and other innovations. No one is interested in the work of a people's assessor. Therefore we are trying at the moment to find ways ensuring that they get paid by the state rather than the enmterprise.

"At the Supreme Soviet I raised one question that is not in the draft: In line with the practice in other countries, we must transfer a specific category of cases (in which the accused is not contesting the charge) to scrutiny by the judge alone.

"Generally speaking, there were no objections to the draft and it was adopted on first reading."

Constitution Committee Head Interviewed

LD2006085991 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1845 GMT 19 Jun 91

["Topical interview" with Sergey Sergeyevich Alekseyev, chairman of the constitutional supervision committee, by unidentified correspondent; place and date not given—live or recorded]

[Excerpts] [Correspondent] Today's Topical Interview on Central Television is with Sergey Sergeyevich Alekseyev, chairman of the constitutional supervision committee. The reason is that we get many letters and very frequent phone calls from our viewers asking questions that we have divided into three groups. The first one is this. To what extent is that which is taking place in Novo-Ogarevo now—the drafting of the new Union treaty, and the session of the group that is drafting the treaty—to what extent does this accord with the adopted constitution by which we live? Doesn't it in some measure run counter to it?

[Alekseyev] [passage omitted] The process of creating a new constitution is under way. Naturally, this cannot, as a matter of principle, fully accord with the existing constitution, as a new constitution is being drawn up. But the drafting of this constituion is taking place on a constitutional basis: by decision of the Congress of People's Deputies, the supreme body of power in our country.

[Correspondent] By the way, many of our viewers have forgotten this and have been asking who the people meeting in Novo-Ogarevo are.

[Alekseyev] The people who meet there are the people stipulated by the Congress of People's Deputies which set up a preparatory commission and adopted the decision to have the Union treaty drafted. And the Union treaty is the nucleus, the principle part, of the future constitution. Six months after the signing of the Union treaty, preparation of the new constitution should be completed. We are keeping a close eye on this in our

Constitutional Supervision Committee. If any difficulties arise, we are prepared to examine them together. As far as I'm concerned, I can tell you that it's a normal constitutional process, and a very major one at that.

[Correspondent] Here is how i would put the second question. Many people also write about our legislative bodies. Our prime minister has now asked to be given legislative functions, even though he represents executive power in this country.

[Alekseyev] Yes, executive and administrative power.

[Correspondent] To what extent does this conform with the regulations and laws of our country?

[Alekseyev] You know, this really is a very complex matter, which gives grounds both for reflection and, as far as I'm concerned, even a certain amount of alarm and concern. The point is that in a genuinely democratic, rule-of-law state there should be a strict separation of powers. There is legislative power, there is executive power, and there is judicial power. Incidentally, the third power, judicial, is represented among other things by our Constitutional Supervision Committee at the level of the supreme bodies of power. Some time ago the Supreme Soviet gave the president a number of legislative powers on a temporary basis, for a year and a half. And, as everyone knows, the president issues decrees. This has already caused certain difficulties. We receive documents and appeals concerning the extent to which the president's actions in the framework of the powers he has been given accord with the constitution and the powers given him by the law of 24 September last year. Thus there is a problem here, and we will be examining this at a meeting of the committee in the very near future.

[Correspondent] Why are you examining this if it was we who gave our president these functions?

[Alekseyev] Well, there's the following question. The president can issue decrees on problems which have not been decided beforehand, but can he change legislative provisions previously adopted by the Supreme Soviet and already in force? Can he adopt such measures?

[Correspondent] Our country is now in an extraordinary situation which, all in all, is acknowledged both by us and the whole world. Given this, are we to live by the laws we worked out ourselves, or are they to be state of emergency laws that belong to an extraordinary period of time?

[Alekseyev] Well, we do not have a state of emergency. It is simply that ours is a very complex situation. A state of emergency is tantamount to a special regime of power. It is provided for by a special legislative package but it has not been introduced in our country. It is simply that we have an extraordinarily complex situation in this country, this is how I would put the issue and the president has been granted these legislative powers [word indistinct] concerning this range of problems for a period of a year and a half. Well, just imagine that legislative powers are also granted to the Cabinet of Ministers—and the Cabinet of Ministers is under the president. In the first place, we would then immediately have three legislative centers. In the second place, one of them—the Cabinet of Ministers—would carry out its legislative powers under the aegis of the president, because it is the president who carries out the highest leadership. It is not difficult to imagine the complexities and difficulties that would arise from this and how these provisions could come into collision with one another. Apart from that, the parliament itself—or the Supreme Soviet, as we call it—will also be deprived, to a significant extent, of its legislative functions. The granting of legislative powers to the Cabinet of Ministers would cause considerable difficulties and problems. It can not be ruled out that a situation which we term a war of laws will arise here, but, imagine, at the very highest level. I think that laws and legislative powers are now beside the point and that it is a matter of implementing the executive functions, so that these laws can have affect and be implemented. Our committee has a right to establish certain normative provisions and we have other powers, too, and here we see the grounds for adopting a serious attitude toward this matter.

[Correspondent] The third question is linked, to a certain extent, with the issue of privatization, of which a very great deal is currently being said and, specifically, with Comrade Sergeyev's speech.

[Alekseyev] Yes, Sergeyev—it was shown on television—he said that privatization was not in keeping with the constitutional foundations of our system. What first and foremost must be taken into account here is the fact that changes have already been introduced into the Constitution.

[Correspondent] Are we going to live according to another constitution?

[Alekseyev] They have already been introduced. Changes were introduced into the 1977 Constitution. These changes make it possible to carry out this dismantling of state controls and privatization; they make it possible already at this stage. Apart from this laws have been adopted in our country, including the ownership law which also orients us to carry out such ownership transformations. Strictly speaking, what we have until recently called social property was not really social property—it was state property, belonging to departments. A genuine and in-depth transformation of this social property must indeed be carried out, so as to unite ownership and producers. Both from the economic and legal viewpoints I think that here, too, everything is in keeping with our legislative and constitutional foundations which make it possible to carry out this process rather effectively. I cannot restrain myself and fail to say that if cardinal and very deep ownership transformations are not carried out in our country then we will not be in a position to expect any sort of changes in the situation in our country, since the key to resolving these issues is the transformation of ownership and it is a very good thing that our state and the Supreme Soviet and the Cabinet of Ministers and other bodies of ours have recently embarked on this path. This is not merely a real entry into the market economy, it is simply a transformation of our whole way of life in the country.

Supreme Soviet Agenda for 20 Jun

LD1906221391 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 2100 GMT 19 Jun 91

[Text] There will be a joint sitting of committees and commissions of both chambers at a session of the USSR Supreme Soviet today [20 June]. A draft law on indexation of incomes of the population will be offered for their consideration. Yesterday committees and commissions discussed a draft law on dismantling state control and privatization of enterprises. Deputies will give a final form to the bill after discussing it at a joint sitting of the chambers next week.

Political & Social

TASS Reports Cabinet of Ministers Meeting

LD1906182691 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1705 GMT 19 Jun 91

[Text] Moscow, 19 June. (TASS)—The draft law on the mortgage-based right to property [zakonoproyekt o zalogovom prave na imushchestvo] is a means of insuring that business partners meet the obligations they adopt. It is also needed as a guarantee by foreign investors willing to invest capital in the Soviet economy. This was stated by USSR Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov at a routine session of the Cabinet of Ministers today.

For the first time in over 70 years, the document permits, on the basis of the law on ownership, the mortgaging of any property or property rights, introduces the institution of mortgage registration, and makes possible the mortgaging of the right to land.

The government also discussed plans to organize paid public work. Specialists who find themselves temporarily out of work will be able to earn extra pay on top of unemployment benefit through working on the improvement of territories' amenities and in the housing, municipal, and social sectors. According to the estimates of experts, in 1992 this form of job placement will be able to provide additional sources of income for about 1.4 million citizens.

The Cabinet of Ministers considered the issue of the apparatus of the central ministries and departments. The total number of personnel employed there is being reduced by 32 percent and will in the future amount to slightly over 36,000. What is more, in the industrial ministries the cuts will in some cases reach as much as 50 percent.

It was reported to members of the government that only 7 percent of the heads of the bodies of state administration today have basic educational qualifications in economics. Without radical measures in this area, it was stressed at the session of the USSR Cabinet of Ministers, innovations in the economy will yield only limited results.

Shcherbakov Interviewed on Economic Issues

LD1906173591 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1949 GMT 18 Jun 91

["Topical interview" with V.I. Shcherbakov, USSR first deputy premier and minister of the economy and forecasting, by S. Medvedev—live or recorded]

[Text] [Medvedev] The topic of today's conversation can perhaps be defined in one brief question. Are we going to live better, and what landmarks do we have for this in what is so far a rather foggy future? But of course, bearing in mind the present state of our economy, one cannot count on a short answer to this question. I am putting it to a man who is now responsible for the state of affairs in the economy, Vladimir Ivanovich Shcherbakov. Vladimir Ivanovich, first of all, I should like, as they say, to clarify your position. Many economists claim that we have stagflation. A difficult time has come. In other words, price rises alongside a fall in production. There is nowhere left to go. Is this the case?

[Shcherbakov] I have already spoken on this topic several times, including in the country's parliament and at the Council of the Federation. As I see it, we are standing on the edge of a precipice and a few steps backward could lead to an irremediable situation from which it would then be really—well, at least we do not know how to do this. We gathered together quite a few specialists and none of them has any idea how we could get ourselves out of such a situation.

But now, it seems to me, and the figures show this, that the situation has stabilized slightly. The decline, at least, has stopped. The decline has stopped not, of course, from the point of view of us working better now than we used to work. But at least in May, we worked no worse than in April.

[Medvedev] But just as poorly.

[Shcherbakov] Just as poorly, yes. But in June also we worked no worse than in May. All in all, some kind of stabilization has been achieved. The decline in acceleration has stopped. But these are just the first steps. And moreover, I should say that on this lake, or in this swamp, a very thin ice has formed. It is still terribly fragile and one can break through it at any moment and fall further down.

[Medvedev] In other words one can say that a whole set of measures is now required of the Cabinet of Ministers to correct the situation and somehow begin to move forward slightly. And here, of course, the anticrisis program on which you have been working has to come into play. At least this is what we all believe. What is the present status of this document?

[Shcherbakov] The present status of the document is this: Of the 13 republics that worked on this document, it has not been signed by Russia and the Ukraine for the following reasons. Russia has not yet fixed on a position regarding federal taxation. All the republics have confirmed that there should be a single federal tax regardless of whether an enterprise belongs to the union or a republic. On the whole, even Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin did not object to this in principle, but said: This matter is so complex that it should be decided by the new president of Russia, but I personally have no objection to this. That was his stance prior to being elected president. I hope that this matter will now be settled and that these words will not remain simply words.

[Medvedev] To put it bluntly, is the center going to receive these taxes from one set of hands from the republics, or via various channels?

[Shcherbakov] Well, so far agreement has not been reached on this matter. On all other problems we do not have any contradictions and have reached agreement. Moldova is willing to sign this document, but is only willing to sign after Russia and the Ukraine. Latvia and Lithuania have said that they have no problems and are willing to participate in implementing the program but that they need a different political reputation, so to speak, in this program. They cannot sign among the 15 union republics, as their supreme soviets have adopted different decisions. So with them it is chiefly a matter of politics. I think that the matter of implementing the anticrisis program has been settled, so the Cabinet of Ministers is not hanging around.

[Medvedev] I was just joing to ask: How long do we have to wait? After all, this could...

[Shcherbakov] We are no longer waiting. We are working on the program.

[Medvedev] But, after all, this could sooner or later become an obstacle to implementation. You will reach a point when consent will have to be obtained.

[Shcherbakov] Undoubtedly, but we hope all the same that the political leadership of the country—I include here not only those who sit in top political seats in Moscow, I also mean the republics—that finally, people will realize that we have indeed reached the edge. And there are some situations where one perhaps has to forgo some of one's principles, if the rest are willing to forgo them for the sake of one thing: the country surviving in this situation. I believe that we are now at precisely this point.

[Medvedev] Much has already been said about this program: There have been official reports and the parliament has heard the prime minister. But all the same, what seems to you to be the chief thing in this document?

[Shcherbakov] The main thing as I see it, looking at it overall, is the fact that everyone sees the way out of today's situation not on the basis of a return to old methods of leading the country but rather in an accelerated—I would not use the word forced—in an accelerated transition period through the introduction of market mechanisms. That is the basis of it all. And these market mechanisms include: Freedom for manufacturers of goods; free prices; freedom of ownership and a diversity of forms of ownership; the dismantling of state control; alteration of the taxation system; making budgets healthier; cutting defense expenditure and administrative expenditure; and radical restructuring of the management of the foreign economic complex.

[Medvedev] That is music to the ears, let me tell you honestly. But how far are can these principles be implemented, and how fast can they be implemented?

[Shcherbakov] The main bulk of the work should be done between June and September.

[Medvedev] Vladimir Ivanovich, a great many very diverse government documents have been adopted before, but it seems to me that one of the shortcomings all these programs suffer is that they were drawn up on an ideological basis. How is ideology in evidence in your program?

[Shcherbakov] I should tell you that the Cabinet of Ministers has always, and most painstakingly, avoided ideological issues. We have tried to deal solely with economic affairs. I therefore never discussed, and try never to enter into discussion, of such issues as whether something belongs to communism or capitalism. This is all stupid, because if we keep on just moaning to one another here about living under socialism or communism, nothing good will come of it. We must take everything we can, including—Lenin, incidentally, said that in order to become a real communist, one must take from capitalism all the best things that mankind has stored up over 1,000 years.

[Medvedev] And are we taking from that now?

[Shcherbakov] I reckon we are. Not everything, of course, there is a great deal that is inappropriate, and so inappropriate, indeed, that sometimes we even fail to understand one another. Take our conversation with President Bush, for instance. I reflected long and hard while I was talking to U.S. experts, why is it that they think our program consists of nothing but commands? I just could not understand what they did not like about it. We said: Here there will be a government resolution, here there will be a law, here there will be this, that, or the other. And they said: But why so many commands? Don't do any of that, let it go by itself. I absolutely could not grasp why what we do, in terms of government action, all of a sudden upset them so much. And then I understood, I asked Bush: Mr. President, I get the impression that our psychological understanding of one another is just so far apart! You see, for a process to get under way in your country, in the States, one probably needs only not to ban it, then without doubt someone will turn up, capital and so on will turn up, and that is all you need for the process to get under way. But we have spent 73 years in a different situation. In our country, one can only do what is permitted. Until you say it is permitted, and confirm it 10 times over...

[Medvedev] ...people will wait...

[Shcherbakov] ...until you put it down on paper, nothing will get done.

[Medvedev] With regard to your trip to the United States of America, incidentally: You had a meeting there with Grigoriy Yavlinskiy...

[Shcherbakov] Yes.

[Medvedev] ...and evidently were briefed on the program he was drawing up and which, he said in an interview, was yesterday to have been on the desk of the USSR president and on that of the U.S. President. What is your assessment of that program?

[Shcherbakov] In the first place, one must understand what his mission was. First, I was present at two or even three conversations with the President. The President said quite clearly what he wanted to see from the work of the Yavlinskiy group. The mission was to analyze our anticrisis program together with...

[Medvedev] The government one?

[Shcherbakov] ...the government one—well, it is now a joint government-union republican government program—to analyze this together with independent U.S. experts, and to try, with the help of financial, technological, consultative, technical assistance, with the help of equipment, to find points of contact, and aid on the part of the West, what would enable us to make this program more radical, shorter, and above all, the main reason this is all necessary, to make the social consequences less painful. The President made a particular point of warning Yavlinskiy that there could be no question of playing one program against the other. We have no intention of retreating from our principles; we have a proper understanding, and what is involved is how to help us achieve what we want to.

[Medvedev] A deputy in parliament yesterday, incidentally, described the Yavlinskiy program, with some fright, as proposing hurricane speeds of privatization.

[Shcherbakov, chuckling] I don't recall who it was—(Zhvanetskiy), was it? One might as well argue about the taste of apples or pineapples with someone who has never tried them. No one has read the program, no one has seen it, so to criticize it is.... I reckon that this criticism derives chiefly from the fact that Yavlinskiy's name has started to crop up in the press too often, and some people get irritated by that. Let's read the thing first. And after all, we ourselves are in favor of rapidly taking property out of state hands, we ourselves, within the country. We want it. It is another question whether we have the resources to do it, whether we have the mechanism developed to do it, to what degree we can succeed in convincing the population of the correctness of the actions being taken, how broad a social basis for privatization we take—these are all quite normal human questions. We, too, have no intention of dragging the process of destatization out over 30 years.

As for the view that top state people are gaining—this means bureaucrats or managers of state enterprises—you know, I always wonder what, strictly speaking, they are gaining. I am today one of what they call the highest-ranking bureaucrats, the first deputy prime minister, but what do I gain from it? All I gain is that half the population already knows my face, and I periodically get stopped in the street and have thoughts fired at me which are not the warmest, you understand. What else? Does my wife go to a different shop, or do I lead some kind of different life? Or do we sit here for 18 hours a day to make a mess of the whole thing? Those things are simply said—oh, I don't know—by people who have a chip on their shoulder or who, through their own ignorance, don't know the facts.

[Medvedev] Vladimir Ivanovich, now, while we are having this conversation—at this very moment, apparently—the prime minister is asking the Supreme Soviet for extraordinary powers. Can you tell us briefly why?

[Shcherbakov] I think that is an inaccurate interpretation. The USSR Government is not seeking any extraordinary powers. We have absolutely no need of any. We are seeking normal powers to do our job, because we have a situation today in which we are, essentially, unable to do anything. We cannot even approach the Supreme Soviet with a legislative initiative, because the government has been deprived of the right of legislative initiative. In 50 percent of cases we cannot take action, because that action has been assigned to the president and the Supreme Soviet. For that reason, we are not talking about extraordinary powers, but are demanding to be given normal conditions for our work, the possibility to make decisions. If the deputies or the president disagree with them, they are entitled to annul them.

Justice Minister Discusses Union Treaty

LD1906222291 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1858 GMT 19 Jun 91

[Interview with Justice Minister S.G. Lushchikov by Yu. Krauze; place and date not given; from the "Topical Interview" program—live or recorded]

[Excerpts] [Krauze] Sergey Gennadiyevich, by all accounts the new Union treaty is on the point of becoming a reality. Much is being written and said about it at the moment, and yet for many people it remains an abstract concept. What can it offer the individual ordinary citizen?

[Lushchikov] First of all, it will give every ordinary citizen stability in our political relations. You know, politics has got under people's skin so much and entered everyone's lives to such an extent that people have forgotten about economic and social interests, their everyday interests. Everyone has started to focus on the broad context of politics. [passage omitted]

[Krauze] Obviously there will have to be quite a major restructuring of the whole of the present system of law and order and of our country's legal system.

[Lushchikov] You are quite right. Evidently, and I can tell you this as the Union minister of justice, we need to create a federal system. What does that mean? Republics exist, and they will have certain specific social relations of their own. Take trafic regulations. For instance, the regulations in Uzbekistan might differ from the traffic regulations in the Ukraine. That is possible. But if we say that we have a common territory, then there must be some sort of economic, currency, and financial relations. This also applies to your question about law enforcement. Everyone is no doubt aware of the U.S. Federal Bureau of Investigation—in other words, a federal police. Ought we to have one? I think we should. This is because of the shadow economy, racketeering, and pressure on our as yet very fragile entrepreneurial foundations. This system needs to be defended.

There is another point. We talk today of zones of conflict, of Azerbaijan and Armenia. I can tell you that to date our courts have failed to hear hundreds of cases. Why is that? It is because Armenian witnesses refuse to testify in an Azerbaijani court. Central Asia has similar problems. We obviously need a network of federal courts—courts that deal with the general interests of the state and are not dependent on some sort of local ethnic or territorial influences. Infosar as the state exists, some kind of federal bodies must exist. This applies to the area of law enforcement above all. Why is that? You no doubt realize that even on a European and world level there is the concept of international crime. There is the Interpol organization for instance.

[Krauze] We have finally joined it.

[Lushchikov] Yes, we have joined. But I just want to say this. Our militia joined it. By the way, it was thanks to Vadim Viktorovich Bakatin, our former minister of internal affairs. Today we are talking of the next stage—a network of federal courts, a federal investigative system, and a federal service for tracing wanted persons. We must go through all these stages as we establish strict law and order, which is what our state must be based on.

[Krauze] All the same, is there hope that the Union treaty will revive some kind of authority and will overcome the paralysis of power?

[Lushchikov] You are quite right. I think that all this euphoria, all these claims of sovereignty, are gradually beginning to recede. People have become fed up with living without guarantees of order. When we have guarantees of compliance with legality, I think we will have the right to expect that implementation of the program for extricating ourselves from the crisis will proceed and that all our economic and social problems will regain their original resonance.

Gorbachev Remarks to Peasant Congress Cited

*PM1906162591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
20 Jun 91 Union Edition p 1*

[Report by I. Abakumov and V. Gavrichkin: "Congress Ends, Problems Remain"]

[Excerpts] The founding congress (stage two) of the USSR Peasant Union ended 18 June in Moscow. [passage omitted]

USSR President M.S. Gorbachev began his speech by reflecting on the difficult road to agreement on the draft Union Treaty and on the progress at last achieved in that very important matter. Immediately he was greeted with... incomprehension. There was even a rejoinder from the audience: The speaker must stick to the agenda. It had to be explained rather sharply that the signing of the Union Treaty is the main question today, including with regard to the solution of the problems presented for discussion at this congress.

It is annoying, of course, that many delegates of the Congresss of the USSR Peasant Union—a sociopolitical organization (this is the definition of its status in the statutes)—did not grasp the nature of the situation: Without a renewed Union it is impossible to create a single economic space and therefore it will be impossible to respond properly to the countryside's vital needs. Apparently some agrarian sector leaders do not realize that the country is entering the market, they have overlooked this point, they do not want to (or can not?) adjust to the new conditions, and they are late in transforming ownership relations and production relations.

The president had to recall again and again that the development of a mixed economy and new forms of management and the perestroyka of production relations are absolutely essential for everyone, including economically strong kolkhozes and sovkhozes. Without this we cannot move forward.

By and large M.S. Gorbachev deemed the Peasant Union's demands set out in a 21-point draft agreement to be reasonable. He did say, however, that the resolution of a number of the issues lies within the republics' competence, and the center can resolve them only with the republics' consent. With regard to prices of agricultural and industrial output, taxation, and compensation to farms for the losses they sustained in the first six months because of the price differentials, the USSR president said: If such problems remain he is prepared to examine them again in conjunction with the Cabinet of Ministers. [passage omitted]

MVD Crime Chief Says Weapons Decree Working

PM1906152591 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 15 Jun 91 First Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Weapons Still Being Seized"]

[Text] On 25 July 1990 a USSR presidential decree was adopted "On Prohibiting the Creation of Armed Formations Not Provided For in USSR Legislation and Seizing Illegally-Held Weapons." At the request of TASS correspondent V. Chichev, Militia Major General N. Khromov, chief of the USSR Internal Affairs Ministry [MVD] Criminal Investigation Administration, talked about the implementation of the decree:

"Immediately after the adoption of the USSR presidential decree, USSR MVD apparatus personnel gave practical assistance to the internal affairs organs of the republics of the Transcaucasus, Central Asia, Baltic, North Caucasus, and other regions of the country. Measures were swiftly carried out to identify bases and weapons dumps and to disarm armed formations. All this led by 1 June to the detection and disbandment of 71 armed groups in the Transcaucasian republics, numbering 1,603 gunmen. By 12 June 52,626 firearms, over 4.5 tonnes of explosives, and 1,367,000 rounds of ammunition had been voluntarily surrendered or seized.

Internal affairs organs in the Ukraine, Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, and the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] are actively involved in the implementation of the decree.

However, in conditions of ceaseless interethnic conflicts, particularly in the Transcaucasian republics, the safe storage of firearms and ammunition has not been properly ensured and the conduct of search and seizure operations is unsatisfactory. This has necessitated the implementation of large-scale operations by USSR MVD internal troops in, for example, the Transcaucasus. As a result of these actions 733 small arms, 390 kg of explosives and explosive devices, four armored personnel carriers, two staff cars, an armored truck tractor, and more than 6,000 cartridges were seized.

Internal affairs organs' investigation bodies have taken criminal proceedings against people who have failed to voluntarily surrender firearms or have stolen them. According to USSR Justice Ministry data, 5,653 people were convicted in the country in 1990 of crimes involving the theft or illegal possession of weapons and ammunition. All this indicates that the USSR president's 25 July 1990 decree is working even now.

Union, Republic MVD's Discuss Anticrime Effort

PM1906162791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Jun 91 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Barriers to Crime. At USSR MVD"]

[Text] Stepping up joint efforts in ensuring public order, combating economic—particularly organized—crime, creating reliable barriers in the path of the illegal distribution of weapons, and also strengthening the militia's social ties with the population—these problems were discussed 18 June at a conference of the USSR MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] leadership and the Union republics' ministers of internal affairs.

Taking part in it were the leaders of the internal affairs ministries of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic], the Ukrainian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic], the Belorussian SSR, the Uzbek SSR, the Kazakh SSR, the Republic of Georgia, the Azerbaijan Republic, the Lithuanian Republic, the Republic of Moldova, the Latvian Republic, the Republic of Kyrgyzstan, the Tajik SSR, the Republic of Armenia, the Turkmen SSR, and the Estonian Republic.

There was a broad exchange of opinions on questions of the application of Union-republic legislation in the activity of internal affairs organs, on the solution of problems relating to personnel, material-technical, and financial backup, as well as on increasing the efficiency of the work of subunits of republic and Union jurisdiction.

Crime knows no national borders. That is why the conference participants paid particular attention to the consolidation of the forces of law and order and the preservation of the integrity of the system of MVD organs as the most important guarantor of the country's internal security. It was noted that the signing of the Union Treaty will require cardinal changes in the system of administration and the formation of new Union structures based on the declarations of state sovereignty pronounced by the republics.

Colonel General B.K. Pugo, USSR minister of internal affairs, participated in the conference.

Shevardnadze Record In, Out of Office Criticized

PM1906120991 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 15 Jun 91 First Edition p 5

[Article by Doctor of Historical Sciences A. Krasnov and Yu. Nikolayev, member of the Russian Communist Party Central Control Commission Presidium: "On the Pendulum of the 'New Thinking.' Concerning the Stance of Ex-Minister E. Shevardnadze."]

[Text] There is no getting away from the harsh truth of life: In the five years of perestroyka not a single one of the politicians who started it (apart from M.S. Gorbachev) has remained at the helm of state leadership. Perestroyka has lost its creators. Some of its initiators fell away against their will during the bumpy ride along the uneven historical ground, others jumped out deliberately, understanding that to carry on traveling would have no prospects for them and would even be dangerous. E.A. Shevardnadze, former member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and former foreign minister, undoubtedly belongs to the latter group. It is doubtful whether he will return to big-time politics, but perhaps he will remain afloat for a certain period of time with the help of an obligingly thrown life belt—the "Foreign Policy Association." Unfortunately, we have still not seen the fruits of our foreign policy activity from the period when E. Shevardnadze occupied the ministerial apartments on Smolensk Square.

In the history of our fatherland there have been two serious defeats in the past two centuries—the Crimean War and the Russo-Japanese War—when diplomats had to display maximum skill to dilute the political consequences of military failures. They coped with their tasks then and, within about 10 years, Russia had fully restored its positions. But what has happened to us in the past five years has no analogy either in our own or in foreign history. During these years, the previously great state which headed a bloc of allied states has turned into a second-rate country, and this was not just under the influence of internal factors. According to all the parameters, the catastrophe that has befallen the USSR in international relations is equal in its consequences to defeat in a third world war which has fortunately not happened. Our state has been deprived of its allies—both those with which we were linked by treaty commitments and those which were very close to us in their sympathies and their adherence to the same ideals. We have obtained nothing in exchange apart from exclamations of approval on the one hand and sympathy on the other. The number of people who hate us has not decreased; on the contrary, it has increased because of those whom we have betrayed or cast aside. This is a depressing result for any diplomat, who should have imprinted in his genes the professional code: "Seek friends for your homeland, and enemies will appear of their own accord."

Not only do we no longer have allies or reliable friends abroad, but the territorial integrity of our own state has been threatened. It is astonishing that, throughout the time between the first moves made by separatists of various hues and the present political cannonade, converted to artillery fire in some places, our foreign policy department has preserved startling diffidence with respect to preserving the USSR's sovereignty and territorial integrity. This clearly looked like a matter of secondary importance to the former foreign minister. Admittedly an article did appear in the press by F. Kovalev, chief of the Historical Diplomatic Administration, who said that the Foreign Ministry archives contain no sign of an original of any secret protocol on the Baltic states to the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact. But this voice was drowned by a forceful speech by A.N. Yakovlev, former member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, who managed to impress on a flabbergasted Congress of People's Deputies that such a protocol could exist and that consequently it must be declared invalid right away. It is surprising, but a fact nevertheless, that for the first time in history a decision has been taken on an absent document. And who can vouch that this is not a question of provocation and falsification? After all, if you follow this method you have to recognize the existence of the well-known protocols of the learned elders of Zion, and Peter the Great's last testament, and many other things that clutter up history. Any educated specialist in international affairs and particularly those who know about "big-time politics," as Shevardnadze likes to say about himself, would never allow themselves to remain silent and consequently concur when it was a question of summing up a legal basis for dismembering a state.

Remember, it is concern about the power, authority, and influence of one's own state that was always considered to be the main commandment for the leaders of foreign policy departments. Talleyrand went down in the history of world diplomacy when he saved France from reprisals after the defeat of Napoleon by putting forward the legitimacy principle at Congress of Vienna. E.A. Shevardnadze headed the Foreign Ministry without any concept, without any practical diplomatic experience, and without the personal qualities of a diplomat—tolerance, patience, and persistence. He continued to rely on the habits he acquired during his years of Komsomol [Communist Youth League] work throughout his party career—his tendency toward empty phrases and a peremptory attitude. But these weapons, though sharpened by the knowledge of the technique of party intrigues, proved powerless when it came to dealing not with colleagues of ordinary caliber but with real professionals from foreign countries, who were able to value and defend the interests of their countries and their classes, were armed with more reliable knowledge, and possessed skill...

The long habit of quick reports of successive victories led Shevardnadze to look for success by giving up positions, making concessions, and sometimes directly capitulating as the only way of remaining in the sphere of attention. A veil was needed to hide the policy of dodging. This was the vague, confused category of the "new thinking," which even M. Zadornov made fun of initially when he perplexed everyone by asking them the difference between "thinking" and "thought." This invention not only meant a rejection of war as a means of resolving arguments between states (the policy of our state was clearly determined before he came to the Foreign Ministry) but, more importantly, this meant the destatization of foreign policy and the giving up of national interests. Is there anyone who does not know that all the countries in the world, even the smallest, live and fight for their national interests? The actual form of existence of peoples within a state obliges their diplomats to fight for their interests and seek advantageous relations with their neighbors and other partners. While the Americans resolved their national tasks by traditional means in Libya, Panama, and Iraq, we played the fool with slogans about deideologization, worldwide nuclear castration, a "European home," and so on, which no one took seriously.

Countless negotiating processes were started hastily and even feverishly, giving the impression of a hive of activity. These included some that were extremely necessary—the trend toward restricting the arms race and reducing the stockpiles of deadly weapons. But an unbearable itch for quick reports of successes urged Shevardnadze to give up positions quickly. The United States only had to categorically reject bringing naval forces into the subject matter of the disarmament talks for all of Shevardnadze's energy to be directed against his own military, who were finally forced to agree to the U.S. position. The vital national interests of the USSR's security were forgotten.

Only one conclusion can be made about the whole bloc of disarmament talks: The United States did not concede on any form of weapon in which it had superiority; all the concessions were made by the Soviet side in the branches and types of weapons where the USSR had superiority. That is why Shevardnadze is still so warmly received in the West and his lectures are heard with such patience...

The USSR Armed Forces and the military-industrial spheres were Shevardnadze's main opponents for a long time even on a personal level. No one will dispute that very serious distortions were committed in our military building, and that the military economy was very neglected. Life insistently demanded the elaboration of a new defense doctrine based on the principle of reasonable sufficiency. Clear practical parameters which took into consideration both the state of the pocket and the national interests needed to be formulated. But, with a stubbornness that should have been saved for his foreign partners, Shevardnadze carried on a confrontational competition with his colleagues in the country's leadership.

Just take the issue of the fate of the Soviet aircraft carriers. Even schoolchildren know that the United States possesses 15 aircraft carriers and is building new ones. Other countries have such ships too. The USSR has only just started approaching this class of ships. One aircraft carrier is undergoing tests and a second has been launched. What is to be done with them? Shevardnadze is categorical: "Destroy them!" But is this sensible? To cut up a finished ship using an autogenous welder and hand it over for resmelting? Would it not be better to stop the further construction of ships, but finish building the existing ones and develop them, train personnel, and improve the equipment? Let it be the minimum that will prevent scientific and technical progress from being extinguished and will prevent us from lagging behind disastrously in questions of naval building. Or have we forgotten that our children and grandchildren will be alive tomorrow and the day after tomorrow?

Of course we must take a reasonable step backward in our military expenditure, of course we must take a step backward in the scale of military production; but Shevardnadze sowed panic with his actions, making people want to flee because of disintegration. To withdraw the forces from Europe more quickly, to destroy intermediate- and shorter-range missiles more quickly, to reduce ground forces more quickly, to destroy chemical weapons more quickly—what does it matter that we do not even have the technical possibilities to do this—everything must be done more quickly, more quickly, more quickly...

And here we have the outcome! On 20 December 1990, without even warning the president of the country, (which is unbelievable in other governments in the world!) E.A. Shevardnadze theatrically announces his resignation to the Congress of People's Deputies. A confused, unconvincing reason—allusions to dictatorship. Almost six months have gone by and it is still impossible to understand where such a threat could come from. And the former minister is still traveling and traveling around foreign countries and harping on about the same threat of dictatorship, in which, I dare say, he himself does not believe. At home he sometimes says with self-satisfaction that it was his resignation that averted the advent of dictatorship. When he is not feeling on top form he admits that he left because he felt guilty about the state of affairs in Georgia, where he was the all-powerful leader from 1972.

E. Shevardnadze's resignation is most likely the expression of fear of facing responsibility for political foppery. The hysterical nature of his resignation amounts to an acknowledgement of his own failure in the face of the chaos of which he himself was one of the authors. Now he is probably going to urge himself on to publish self-justifying memoirs abroad as quickly as possible! Incidentally, this will also mean getting significant royalties in dollars.

It is probably no fun for the former minister of foreign affairs to be in his motherland, which is why he clutches at every invitation, regardless of whom it is from, just so that he does not have to look his betrayed fellow citizens in the eye. And when you are acclimatizing yourself to foreign places, you have to pay for the opportunity by spitting on your motherland. A person who obtained so much from a party career now has to publicly state: "Socialism in the USSR was a mistake which can be corrected." In passing he calls our society and our people corrupt... This is what the relentless "patriot" is like.

He probably brought great pleasure to his new patrons by putting forward the idea of using UN forces to resolve interethnic conflicts in the USSR. Truly he could go no further! And indeed, was this "idea" really his? Very similar ideas are being voiced in the United States about establishing guardianship of the USSR. We can assume that in his next "revelations" in the West the ex-minister will speak of how many forces under the UN flag the Soviet Union will need, where they will be recruited from (there will clearly not be enough traditional Swedes and Finns), the time frame of their presence, and who will pay for keeping them on the boundless expanses from Osh Oblast to the Vilnius area. Maybe he will disclose who will lead these contingents? After all, rumors are circulating around international bars that E. Shevardnadze is laying claim to the post of UN secretary general.

The fact that such "ideas" are causing indignation among sensible people in the USSR is natural and comprehensible. It is good that by no means everyone trusts political chameleons in the West either. In its 13 April article "The Bloody Past of Eduard Shevardnadze" the WALL STREET JOURNAL says that he bears responsibility for "terrible acts of cruelty and repression in the USSR, which were applied on a massive scale in the past." In this connection it is proposed that the attitudes of the administration and U.S. public organizations regarding the organization of further contacts with Shevardnadze be reexamined.

Even there people are even beginning to understand the true value of the speeches and actions of the ex-minister, who still considers himself an important and authoritative expert on big-time politics...

Possibility of CPSU Split Discussed

LD1906112491

[Editorial Report] Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian at 1500 GMT on 17 June carries a 45-minute studio discussion on the possibility of a split within the CPSU with an unidentified moderator and participants Vladimir Nikolayevich Lysenko, Vyacheslav Shostakovskiy, and Stepan Sulakshin, representatives of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Republican Party; Grigoriy Vodolazov, Boris Milhailovich Pugachev, and Yelena Lukashenko, representatives of Communists for Democracy; and the historian Vladen Georgiyevich Sirotkin.

After an introduction by the moderator, Lysenko speaks: "Today the attention of society is once again fixed on the CPSU. On the one hand this party during the period that has elapsed since the 28th Congress of the CPSU has managed to bury the 500-days program and has waged an unprecedented campaign of lies and slander against Yeltsin as candidate for the presidency of the Russian Federation. On the other hand, the Communists for Democracy movement has made its appearance—to begin with at the Congress of People's Deputies of Russia—and today this movement has become virtually a movement of the whole Russian Republic.

"In this connection I would like to begin the discussion with a movement that has already existed in the CPSU. I am referring to the Democratic Platform, which came into being on the eve of the 28th CPSU Congress. It had mass character. To it belonged the party organizations of nearly 70 oblasts in the Russian Federation. This movement was headed by such famous leaders as Boris Yeltsin, Yuriy Afanasyev, Popov, Sobchak, Travkin, Gdlyan, Ivanov, and a whole number of other well-known people's deputies of the Soviet Union. In coming to the 28th Congress of the CPSU, which took place last year, this movement had complete grounds for hoping to see the splitting of the CPSU, for by that time various factions and groups were already clearly coming into being and it seemed that a split of that kind would be inevitable. However, a split in the CPSU did not take place. The reasons given today as to why that did not happen include the undemocratic character of the elections to the Congress. Whereas according to polls conducted by sociologists about 40 percent of the Communists supported the Democratic Platform, in actual fact it received only one percent of the delegates at the 28th Congress of the CPSU. On the other hand, they said the Democratic Platform did not conduct itself actively at the 28th Congress of the CPSU. Third, we did not manage to reach agreement with the democratic forces that existed in the leadership of the party. At any rate, after the Russian party conference, when Polozkov was elected first secretary of that Communist Party, there was great indignation in the party of Communists over this and there was a wonderful situation for indeed splitting the CPSU from the top. There were rumors that Gorbachev was quitting the post of general secretary and at the Congress we tried to persuade Aleksandr Nikolayevich Yakovlev to stand for the post of general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. In that event, I think, merely by giving his word Yakovlev could have divided the party at the 28th CPSU Congress, for I think he would then have been followed by millions of Communists.

"On the whole, though—to speak in objective terms—I think the main reason why a split in the CPSU did not take place at that time and why the attempt by the Democratic Platform ended in failure, lies in the fact that at that time the CPSU was (?in ferment) only at the bottom. At the level of the primary party organizations we had mass support, but there was total calm and total unity in the top echelons of the party and in its middle-level detachments. Neither in the Politburo nor in the CPSU Central Committee nor in one single oblast committee, city committee, or rayon committee of the CPSU did they go over to the side of the Democratic Platform. The experience of the Eastern European Communist Parties, on the other hand, shows that a split is possible only in cases where the boundary runs from the top toward the bottom. On that occasion it ran only through the lower level of the development of the Communist Party. At the Congress, therefore, the Democratic Platform effectively announced its departure from the CPSU. After the Congress three million people left the CPSU, but they left with nearly all of them having nowhere to go. Today our Republican Party, which was formed from the Democratic Platform, numbers several thousand people."

The moderator then says: "And so it turned out that it was not possible to reform the CPSU by parliamentary means. But you representatives of the Communists for Democracy movement set about doing virtually the same work that the members of the Democratic Platform wanted to carry out a year ago."

To which Vodolazov replies: "It is a little different from the work of the Democratic Platform. You are right, Vladimir Nikolayevich, when you say that our movement, Communists for Democracy, has indeed become a republican movement. Organizational committees of our movement have been established in many towns and oblasts. We are preparing our own republican conference or congress—we are going to think about what name to give it—which will take place in the fall. And thought is now taking place about the theoretical and political reference points of our movement.

"I would like to mention the main direction of our quest so that our position is understood. Unlike the Democratic Platform, as I understand it, from the very beginning we have not sought to renew the CPSU. We have not sought this task becasue we consider the CPSU to be an organization and a structure which in principle is not renewable. The CPSU is a part of the administrative-command totalitarian system which came into being in our state in former years and the CPSU was its core. That is the kind of organization it was. Today it is objectively a question of dismantling both that totalitarian system and the CPSU as its core. What is the form in which this dismantling takes place? It takes place objectively. When you were saying that the democratic platforms, so to speak, were splitting the CPSU, today the CPSU is being divided and delimited in ideological and political terms by all forces—and this means the initiative people from Leningrad; an organization has effectively been set up—and they were represented at the elections by Makashov and Sergeyev; this means the leadership of the Russian Communist Party and its supporters; this means the center, from Gorbachev leftwards, perhaps as far as Shevardnadze and Yakovlev; this means the democratic or left wing of the CPSU, the Communists for Democracy. Thus, the Communists for Democracy are members of the CPSU who participate in the dismantling of the totalitarian, administrative-command system of the CPSU and in the creation of new democratic public structures and new political parties. We see our future as lying not in the creation of a new party out of the Communists for Democracy movement. It is now a question of having ideological and political demarcation within the CPSU and afterwards. We believe that we are now in a state of political transition and that after this monster disappears, this organization of the CPSU as a part of the totalitarian system, the normal formation of political parties will then begin. And they will then be formed on a different basis. Some of our comrades, for example, can join the Social Democrats, with the Republicans, with the party of Nikolay Ilich Travkin, and so on. The program making of these parties will be new in principle in comparison with what is taking place today. Thank you."

Vladlen Sirotkin puts the situation into historical perspective, drawing comparisons with the old quarrel between the Bolsheviks and Mensheviks. He notes that its roots go back to prerevolutionary times in that many structures which inhibit reform were inherited from those days.

The moderator sums up: "Everything you say suggests the struggle for reform in this party is virtually impossible and that those who try to reform the CPSU are in fact waging a struggle against the whole pyramid and all structures of power."

Addressing Pugachev, the moderator says: "Incidentally, what happened to you when you joined the Communists for Democracy movement?" After reflecting on the nature of the CPSU today, Pugachev answers: "I was in the party for many a long year. I was painfully aware of what was taking place in the country in the country and could not express it for a number of reasons. But now one can tell the whole truth about the kind of party and the kind of country we are in, about what we should do. And to give a direct answer to your question, after the well-known speech by Gorbachev in Minsk—a tendentious speech moving toward the right-wing circles—I wrote an article in the newspapers, in ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA and NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA, together with Yelena Lukashenko who is present here now, about the right-wing coup in the CPSU. We had a kind of realization of our involvement in the party. What is the party? Well, I had to work—in those days I worked at the Academy of Social Sciences, that brain, that (?workshop) of the intellect, as the leaders of the Academy put it. But history repeated itself as it is repeating itself with the Democratic Platform. There was a telephone call from Gorbachev demanding that things be sorted out with the authors of this article. There was a closed sitting of the party committee and explanations at rector level and we were obliged to leave the Academy—Lukashenko, Yelena, and I were obliged to leave. But our own fate is not the point. The point is that millions of honest people today remain the hostages of this party of bureaucrats. Something has to be done."

Vyacheslav Shostakovskiy agrees that it is essential for party structures to be dismantled. "The party that has been ruling with a monopoly of power has naturally accumulated within itself socially active people, but nevertheless it will no doubt not be amenable to reform and it must be dismantled. I remember now how similar processes took place, say, under the conditions of the collapse of the totalitarian regime in Spain. In ten months Franco's National Movement split into a number of parties. From this National Movement came the neo-fascist structure, the Social Democrats, the Socialists, and many other political structures. Why is this not taking place in our country? Because the part of the party that is the apparatus personifies the party in power. There is nothing at all. There are no other values than power. They are willing to betray any idea, to turn themselves around. They accuse us of having turned, but in actual fact they are prepared to do anything in order to preserve power. And that is why all kinds of formulas are invented, like the socialist market, say. Why the socialist market? Because the desire is there to keep the distributive economy and somehow or other keep themselves in power longer and longer. This the main task. For this very reason it is essential that the party be dismantled. As far as persecution of supporters of the Democratic Platform is concerned, that is an absolutely natural reaction."

The moderator asks Pugachev: "When you were forming your Communists for Democracy movement it was first and foremost a question of the ideological sphere, the ideological level. But what do you intend to do with the economy? The party is involved in it to a considerable extent, with industry, with agriculture. Do you not have your own program here?"

Pugachev replies: "You know, I would not agree with you. The formation of the movement took place in a specific, actual situation. The Third Congress of People's Deputies of Russia was taking place. There was an onslaught against Yeltsin. The center of Moscow was blockaded with troops. And here there was an attempt to remove Boris Nikolayevich. But, there were Communists in the hall. And speaking on their behalf were Polozkov and others. And it was there that the parliamentarians felt moral discomfort, moral responsibility for what might happen here, something that could not be corrected. And this is where the Rutskoy [leader of the Communists for Democracy movement] phenomenon took place. I was present at the Congress as an expert. I met Rutskoy at the Third Congress. It was a powerful breakthrough. Immediately 170 deputies went for this direction of thought, democratization of the party, the preservation of democratic Russia."

Moderator: "So the result is this. Some Communists who were people's deputies at a certain particular moment quite simply engaged in political struggle?"

Pugachev: "Absolutely."

Moderator: They engaged in what a political party should be doing?"

Pugachev: "Absoluely."

Moderator: "And here I would like to make one point. The Communists for Democracy movement set out along a civilized path of political struggle, in the specific historic situation, in the specific situation, simply not thinking about agriculture, not thinking about whatever else?

Pugachev: "Absolutely. It was the preservation of this process of the renewal of Russia, the preservation of the political forces which are conducting it, and thereafter they started to think about what the CPSU now was. A whole series of theoretical articles of ours were published which were prepared collectively by Grigoriy Grigoriyevich and myself and other comrades. We started to have conversations with Polozkov. I had conversations with Polozkov. Can he consider himself to be a Communist? I personally think Polozkov cannot consider himself to be a Communist. I personally think the leadership of the party, the Russian Communist Party, has now been seized by anti-Communists, and in the latest edition of the weekly ROSSIYA I wrote an article about the anti-Communists from the CPSU. But the paradox is that they do not notice us. We had 50 million copies of articles about our movement. We have a leader who was nominated as candidate for the vice presidency of Russia. But Polozkov's party remains silent. Is it not capable of dialogue? Plain cowardice. What lies behind this? I simply do not know."

Vodolazov speaks: "I would like to add to what Boris Mikhaylovich has been saying and polemicize. Quite honestly I personally am not interested in having a dialogue with Ivan Kuzmich. It is not a question of dialogue. We are simply people who ought to be in different political organizations from Makashov, Nina Andreyeva, and Polozkov. And we can conduct the dialogue in the parliamentary arena as representatives of different political tendencies. We must simply dissociate ourselves, go our separate ways and get rid of this common label that unites us together. We are often asked whether it isn't nonsense to talk about Communists for Democracy? Is it not nonsense for members of the CPSU, the party which was the creator of the totalitarian system, the party which is responsible for the crimes against its own people, for the Stalinist collectivization, for the shootings in the 1930's is it not nonsense for the members of this party to suddenly announce that we are for democracy, we are going to so to speak [changes thought] I think there is a problem, but it isn't nonsense. Why? Because the CPSU has never been a normal political party. It was a totalitarian organization of state rule and it always contained at least two currents or two parties—the party of the nomenklatura, the partocracy, the party of anti-popular aspirations and interests, and the democratic traditions and democratic currents in the party. In other words, the idea of Ernst Neizvestnyy on the monument to Khrushchev—the black and the white—it was present in this party in real terms. The democratic traditions were there from the start of the 1930's you understand—the anti-Stalinist manifesto of Ryutin, the thousands of young Communists who came out against the Stalinist form of collectivization who went into the jails and were shot in the 1930's. In other words the party is the party not only of those who did the shooting, as they say, but the party of those who were shot, too."

Vodolazov continues: "We want to be the godfathers and the continuers of this democratic tradition, but not just of that one, of the democratic tradition that also existed in other political trends and spheres. And about your other point—the economic program, the economic approach. I will say just one thing. We are in favor of market system of relations. At the same time we stress that...well, Polozkov and the initiative group ask us how the working man will be protected from the market. We think that first and foremost the working man has to be protected against the talentless and parasitic bureaucracy, against its arbitrary rule in matters of distribution, which we have been coming up against for many decades, which distributed not in accordance with labor, but arbitrarily in its own interests. The market, therefore, is a means of protecting the working man against this bureaucracy. It is a means of distributing things in accordance with one's labor. Secondly, two dangerous new social forces are making their appearance on this market which is being formed. The first of them is the nomenklatura which is privatizing itself: ministers, top echelons of party workers who move from ministries into concerns, and joint enterprises using their privileged state and party positions; and the mafia-type economy which closes in with them. Here we are working out a system of measures for the market economy to protect the working people against these forces."

The moderator then asks: "Stepan Stepanovich, perhaps you could describe for us from your own point of view the essence of the differences between the Democratic Platform—now the Republican Party—and the Communists for Democracy movement?"

Sulakshin replies: "To do this more conveniently I would return to the initial question that was asked: Is a split in the CPSU possible? It seems to me this is putting the issue too narrowly. In actual fact the Communists for Democracy movement is to a large extent the successor of the methods, tenets, and goals which the Democratic Platform tried to implement last year. In actual fact there is definite experience that our colleagues were able to use and I already see that in part they are also beginning to repeat our mistakes."

Sulakshin continues: "While still remaining inside the CPSU—my colleagues here will agree with me—it will be impossible to solve these problems. There are rules in existence; there is corporate, inner-party discipline. But, if we tackle these tasks consistently and logically to the end I am convinced the distance between these two tables will become much shorter and that in the future our colleagues who are members of the Communists for Democracy movement will inevitably be compelled to dissociate themselves organizationally and resolve the issue of the juridical division of the CPSU, including its property—which has been accumulated in disregard of its actual competence—and that of its return to the state and so on. And we will once again be on the same side of the front, the front of the struggle against Soviet totalitarianism. Therefore, we are certainly prepared to give our experience to our colleagues and to cooperate with them and I note with satisfaction that despite small differences in the Communists for Democracy movement about whom to support—Boris Yeltsin or Vadim Bakatin—such differences do exist there. Nevertheless, in this election campaign we have worked together in many respects. Locally, cells of the Communists for Democracy movement and of the Republican Party of Russia have linked their efforts in order to ensure that Boris Yeltsin becomes president."

Vodolazov comments: "I would like to object to somethjing Stepan Stepanovich Sulakshin said in accusing us of failing to learn from their mistakes. Stepan Stepanovich, I think we do learn from mistakes. I think that one of your mistakes was to let organizational dissociation take place before ideological and political dissociation. What we want is for ideological and political demarcation to take place first, for the democratic party masses to be united and consolidated, and afterwards, of course, and I have said this, the question of organizational dissociation will also arise.

"And my very last point. I do not just see mistakes in your activity and that of your Democratic Platform and the Republican Party. It seems to me that the main result is a plus. You are doing in your own way and from the other side the same work that we are doing from within, and both kinds of work are necessary. In other words, we have very great respect for your choice and we condemn the speech by Gusev at the 28th Congress of the party, which was essentially an attack on you. But, we think Communists who are members of the CPSU and who remain within the party are making a choice that is no less worthy. And this Yeltsin- Rutskoy bloc is the implementation of this great political idea of the unity of the democratic forces in the face of totalitarianism."

Shostakovskiy responds: "I do not agree totally with Grigoriy Grigoriyevich about ideological and theoretical demarcation being needed first. It is impossible because the party apparatus will migrate in the interests of preserving its power, taking on any kind of ideological coloring. It will accept anything. The organizational issue cannot therefore be ignored, but it seems to me that today the essence is that the CPSU, and particularly the Communist Party of the Russian Federation, are increasingly playing—and this is perfectly obvious—the most destabilizing role in society, a destabilizing role. This can clearly be seen with the election campaign of Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin. The section of the party that is the apparatus would resort to foul actions of any kind—falsehoods, whatever you like—if only it could hamper the election of Boris Yeltsin as first president of the Russian Federation. Why? Because then real reform would begin. The transition to the market means political death for the CPSU and for the Russian Communist Party. It will simply remove it to the periphery of political life and from this point of view Boris Mikhaylovich has put forward a very important theses about the moral and political self-determination of every Communist. In the final analysis, people will either remain obedient taxpayers, maintaining this destructive apparatus of the CPSU, or people will understand that in the interests of society and in the interests of the people they must stop feeding this pinnacle, they must reduce to the minimum the opportunities that it enjoys, so to speak, for exerting a destructive influence upon the political situation in the country. Because new political structures and new political influences including those of the Republican Party of the Russian Federation will grow up. Its priority is the full-blooded sovereignty of the Russian Federation in the first place.

"In the second place—and this is perhaps the most important priority—the freedom of the person. When Polozkov says that we must feed people it is bluff, it is nonsense. No general secretary and no first secretary ever feeds anyone. The party does not feed anyone either. Conditions must be created for people so that they can feed and clothe and shoe themselves, relying upon their own creative potential, upon their abilities, upon their love of work. These are the priorities of the Republican Party and they are penetrating ever more widely into our periphery, so to speak."

The discussion program ends with a brief contribution from Vladlen Georgiyevich Sirotkin, who draws some parallels between the present situation and the past.

IZVESTIYA Protests Anti-Glasnost Offensive

PM2006082791 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 19 Jun 91 p 1

[Report by Igor Korolkov: "IZVESTIYA: We Cannot Live Like This"]

[Text] Noted for its moderate stance, adhering to left-centrist views, and avoiding extreme judgments, the newspaper has ventured on a step unbecoming to its status—it has voiced a resolute protest at an attempt to change the newspaper's political course.

The new twist to the conflict was prompted by Yefimov's appointment of NEDELYA's new editor. He did this off his own bat, behind the back of the editorial board, relying on an ordinance from USSR Supreme Soviet Chairman Anatoliy Lukyanov, although Lukyanov must have no bearing on the appointment. This question is decided only by NEDELYA's founder—IZVESTIYA.

Two important points should be noted here. IZVESTIYA's deputy chief editors and members of the editorial board sent Lukyanov a letter asking for the situation to be elucidated: Is it true that an appointment is being prepared? How does this fit in with the proclaimed policy of glasnost? Why is this being done behind the founder's back? This was the reaction to the letter: The next day Vladimir Sevruk was confirmed in the post of NEDELYA's editor. But it must be said—and this is the second important point—that Vladimir Nikolayevich worked for long years in the CPSU Central Committee Ideological Department and was a persecutor of all freethinking in the Soviet press.

During these very same days, regardless of the editorial board's opinion and totally unexpectedly for the editorial office, one more first deputy chief editor was appointed. He is Dmitriy Mamleyev, deputy chairman of the USSR State Committee for Publishing Houses, Printing Plants, and the Book Trade.

It was pointed out at a news conference which IZVESTIYA staffers held yesterday for representatives of Soviet and foreign mass media in the House of the Journalist that a massive offensive against glasnost is taking place. The attempt which Mikhail Gorbachev made at the USSR Supreme Soviet session to suspend the Law on the Press failed, and the party-administrative system has chosen a different way to crush the democratic course in the mass media—by pursuing a special cadre policy. Its henchmen are ending up in key posts. A natural contradiction is emerging: Under conditions of democratic transformations they are trying to control the newspapers as in the times when the CPSU held complete sway.

Answering journalists' questions as to whether IZVESTIYA staffers intend to quit the newspaper as a mark of protest, it was said that they will do everything possible just to preserve the newspaper's complexion, its course, and its highly skilled personnel. If this fails, IZVESTIYA will evidently lose its best journalists. A strike is not yet planned.

The text of a deputies' question to Lukyanov in connection with the situation which has taken shape at IZVESTIYA was read out at the news conference. It was signed by Yegor Yakovlev, Galina Starovoytova, Mark Zakharov, Yuriy Afanasyev, and other USSR people's deputies.

TASS Reviews Press for 20 Jun

LD2006063291 Moscow TASS in English 0623 GMT 20 Jun 91

["Soviet Press Review" —TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow June 20 TASS—Today's PRAVDA and SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA report a meeting between President Mikhail Gorbachev, who is also Soviet Communist Party leader, and General Secretary of the Greek Communist Party Central Committee Alexandra Papariga.

Gorbachev and Papariga discussed Soviet reforms. They favoured developing Soviet-Greek economic cooperation for the benefit of strengthening international stability and developing the all- European process.

Newspapers write about a meeting of the Soviet Cabinet, which discussed a bill on the mortgage right to property.

For the first time in 70-odd years, this bill will permit to mortgage any property and ownership rights on the basis of the law on property ownership, introduce the institute of mortgage registration and make possible mortgaging the right to land.

The Cabinet discussed plans to organize paid public works. Specialists, who find themselves temporarily out of work, will be able to earn sums in addition to and above their dole by working in the social sphere or servicing housing facilities and public utilities. Experts estimate that about 1.4 million people are likely to use this additional income source in 1992.

The Cabinet also considered staff problems at federal ministries and departments. The number of their staff members will be reduced by 32 per cent to reach a total of 36,000. Staffs will be cut by as much as 50 per cent at some ministries.

Newspapers publish the final results of the first presidential elections in Russia on June 12. According to the Central Election Commission, Boris Yeltsin has become Russian President, receiving 57.3 per cent of the vote.

SELSKAYA ZHIZN continues publishing a verbatim record of the second stage of the USSR Farmers Union constituent congress.

SOVETSKAYA ROSSIA carries an interview with USSR People's Deputy Viktor Alksnis, who visited South Ossetia with a group of deputies from the Soyuz association.

Alksnis said a "war is really under way" in South Ossetia. He denounced the position of the centre, which "left the people of South Ossetia to the mercy of fate". South Ossetia has been subjected to aggression on the part of the Georgian nationalist leadership for its wish to remain in the Soviet Union, he said.

KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA writes about terrorism in the Soviet Union, its reasons and the influence of "foreign experience" on the process.

Newspapers carry materials devoted to the 50th anniversary of the Nazi Germany's invasion of the Soviet Union.

PRAVDA publishes a dialogue between writer Vyacheslav Kondratyev and author Viktor Kozhemyako. They analyse what helped the Soviet people subjected to an unexpected, powerful and well-prepared aggression, overcome Fascism.

They are also trying to understand whether or not today's youth values the heroic deeds of their grandfathers and fathers and whether or not their traditions are living in the Soviet Army today.

The Soviet Navy was among Soviet Army units ready for the perfidious attack on June 22, 1941, Soviet Deputy Defence Minister Admiral V. Chernavin writes in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA.

TRUD publishes extracts from memoirs by a head of the Nazi intelligence Walter Schellenberg.

Newspapers focus on the conference of the foreign ministers of CSCE member-states in Berlin. They note that the results of the conference will be an important step on the road to a new integrated Europe.

Newspapers report the beginning of Russian President Boris Yeltsin's visit to the United States. PRAVDA carries his answers to correspondents' questions, after his meeting with U.S. Congressmen.

Yeltsin said his relations with President Mikhail Gorbachev have become "balanced". Noting that they still differ on some issues, Yeltsin said they are trying to find a compromise and conduct businesslike discussions.

Economic

New Customs Duties To Be Introduced 1 Jul

LD1906153591 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0915 GMT 19 Jun 91

[Summary] Moscow, 19 June (TASS)—From 1 July 1991 the USSR Customs Committee, by agreement with the USSR Ministry of Finance, is introducing new customs duties on objects sent by mail and imported by citizens crossing the USSR state borders, reports the USSR Customs Committee press center. The new rates do not affect existing rules for import and export by Soviet citizens of goods and currency for their own private use, and bought for currency obtained in the prescribed way. It is also borne in mind that from December 1990 the value of objects to be brought into the USSR as gifts, custom-free, was increased from 500 to 1,000 rubles.

Food and prime necessities brought in for charity are also customs-free.

If the limits of private use are slightly exceeded, the minimum customs duty rates are applied, adjusted taking into account the price reform and the increased retail prices of consumer goods. These rates will be applied also in the dispatch of objects by mail for missions of foreign firms and also for Soviet organizations not taking part in foreign economic activity.

A different customs rate is applied when under cover of objects for personal use goods are imported for subsequent sale on the country's internal market. Then, the customs rate will be equal to the rate of the importation on similar goods imported into the USSR in the course of foreign economic operations.

The aim of the measure is to increase equal conditions for owners of imported goods during their importation into the USSR in the framework of trade and non-trade turnover.

U.S. Businesses Continue Move Into USSR

IBM Opens Subsidiary

LD1906152291 Moscow TASS in English 0740 GMT 19 Jun 91

[By correspondent Andrey Chytov]

[Excerpts] New York June 19 TASS—International Business Machines (IBM), the world's largest corporation producing computers, has announced opening its subsidiary in the Soviet Union.

A new firm, IBM USSR, will be owned by the U.S. corporation. According to its representatives, this is the first company in the Soviet Union completely owned by international capital.

The IBM leadership decided to open a subsidiary in the Soviet Union, after a visit to Moscow in January. During the visit, they met president Mikhail Gorbachev. [passage omitted]

The corporation opened a office in the Soviet Union in 1974, but until recently the scale of its business operations on the Soviet market was rather modest mainly due to Washington's restrictions on exports of U.S. technology.

After soviet-U.S. relations began to improve, IBM took advantage of the new possibilities. A year ago, the corporation signed a contract on the delivery of 13,000 personal computers for Soviet schools.

According to IBM, the order is being implemented ahead of the schedule, and the corporation is working on agreements to sell another 40,000 computers to the Soviet Union towards the same ends.

In addition, talks are underway to supply electronic systems to control passenger and cargo traffic on Soviet airways. The corporation is discussing the possibility of launching a plant to assemble IBM computers in the Soviet Union.

Gillette in Joint Venture

OW2006041391 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1200 GMT 19 Jun 91

[From "Business Today"; following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] America's Gillette and Leningrad's Leninets Company are expected to launch a $60m project to manufacture razor blades and equipment, with the first batch of Gillette products to be put on sale next year.

The Soviet company is to borrow from a foreign bank to pay for Gillette production lines, but the bank's name was not identified.

Leninets Company has a 64

share of the razor blades market in the Russian Federation.

Falin Rejects Harvard Aid in Drafting Plan

AU2006095891 Munich SUEDDEUTSCHE ZEITUNG in German 20 Jun 91 p 26

["Jas" report: "Falin Rejects Harvard Plan for Several Reasons"]

[Text] Duesseldorf—Valentin Falin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and Mikhail Gorbachev's foreign policy adviser, spoke in favor of the Soviet Union going its own way out of a "very deep crisis" at the Ingersoll Engineers forum in Duesseldorf, thus indirectly rejecting the help of the U.S. Harvard University in drafting a plan to reorganize the Soviet economy (Yavlinskiy model). The demonopolization of enterprises, not the quick privatization of enterprises in the USSR, is currently the most important task on the way out of the planned economy, said Falin, who was Soviet ambassador to Bonn between 1971 and 1978. He considers the form of ownership a secondary problem. Falin believes that the economic misery in his country was caused by the fact that essential ministries, including the Economics Ministry, were abandoned after the party relinquished a great deal of its power in the middle of 1988. Thus, leading positions were assumed by opportunists and not by the most clever people.

Falin Deplores State of Soviet Economy

AU1906173091 Hamburg DIE WELT in German 19 Jun 91 p 10

["Wtm" report: "Falin: We Had No Strategy"]

[Text] Duesseldorf—"We have succeeded in stopping the further decline of our economy at the end of May/beginning of June." With these words, Valentin Falin, former USSR ambassador to Bonn and closest adviser of Mikhail Gorbachev, rejected the horrorific visions of a renewed production decreases of 10 to 20 percent this year. At an event organized by the Ingersoll Engineers company in Duesseldorf, the 64-year-old diplomat admitted that there are still enormous problems in industry and agriculture. In his view, one of the reasons is the strike wave for which Boris Yeltsin is responsible. Of the 121 furnaces of the Soviet steel industry, 41 are currently idle and 26 are kept ready for operation. The consequences are massive production losses in the steel industry, with serious consequences for all branches. Thus, 2,000 newly tapped oil wells cannot start production because pipes and other equipment are not available. This is all the more serious because oil is one of the few export products that provides the Soviet Union with hard currency needed for importing technology, medicines, and foodstuffs.

Thousands of combine harvesters are standing in factories and cannot be delivered because essential subcontractor products are missing. "Yeltsin launched a very destructive campaign," Falin accused the freely elected Russian president. He also expressed doubts as to the lawfulness of the elections and their democratic legitimacy. What Yeltsin failed to achieve—if it is true —was brought about by the collapse of CEMA. As recently as in 1988, trade with the fraternal socialist countries amounted to 78.9 billion convertible rubles, in 1989 it dropped to 57.7 billion rubles, and in 1990 the exchange of goods was practically reduced to zero. These enormous losses and the abandonment of labor division triggered a chain reaction for which the leadership in Moscow was not prepared. "We had no strategy to reactivate these trade relations," Falin stated. He also admitted that the Soviet Union made "serious mistakes concerning the division of labor."

The Gorbachev adviser stressed that medical care is "catastrophic" at the moment. Only 40 percent of the demand for pharmaceuticals can be covered at present. About 800 pharmaceutical firms had to close down because important subcontractors from Armenia, for example, no longer supply the required basic chemical materials. There is no hard currency available for imports.

Falin made a very resigned impression in Duesseldorf. "All this may one day have very dramatic consequences, and we are witnessing their development." The senior diplomat did not rule out the danger of a military coup if the country plunges into economic and political chaos.

The situation will exacerbate if a crop failure occurs again this year, which might cause famine among the population. As a matter of fact, there was only a 1.7 percent loss in winter grain this year (4 to 5 percent last year). However, the harvest is threatened by the worst drought in 100 years in Kazakhstan and the Caucasus. About 1.5 to 2 million Soviet citizens will emigrate to the West in the near future, Falin believes. Falin sees opportunities in the technological know-how of the arms industry, in the intelligent conversion of tanks to civilian products. Weapons production accounts for 24 percent of the gross national product in the Soviet Union (1.4 to 1.6 percent in the United States). In addition, productivity is eight times higher in the arms industry than average productivity. On the other hand, 80 percent of all engineers are working in the weapons industry. "We have hundreds of top-quality products here," that are never used in the civilian sphere, Falin stressed. "The list of banned products between our military and our civilian industries is much longer than the one between NATO and the Soviet Union."

Priority must be given to the conversion of the weapons industry to high-quality civilian products, not to simple products such as pans or tin cans. If this cannot be achieved, senior technicians and scientists, chemical engineers and physicists will emigrate, Falin fears. Ingersholl President Bodo F. Holz estimated the investments required to modernize the Soviet economy and to safeguard 80 million jobs at 16 billion German marks, a figure that Falin accepted without any comment. It was agreed that the German industry is to assume an important role in rebuilding the Soviet Union.

Economic Model for Coming Year Questioned

PM1906110191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Jun 91 Second Edition p 1

[Article by political observer Aleksandr Nikitin: "Model for the Year Ahead"]

[Text] It is said that comparisons make everything clear, much more so the economy—if, of course, there is something to compare. That is the idea prompted by the USSR Cabinet of Ministers resolution on organizational measures to elaborate socioeconomic development programs and forecasts for enterprises, regions, republics, and the country as a whole for 1992. This development, I would particularly note, will be "under the conditions of the shaping of market relations."

The elaboration of this model should be conducted exclusively from below. Probably the most reliable version of economic relations will be the contract. Contracts concluded between enterprises for next year will not be altered, but they will be taken fully into account in forecast balances. And if this truly is the case, "Mr. Almighty Contract" will rise to a new level. And everything new will have to be geared to the interests of producers and their autonomy.

So the question arises: What kind of autonomy? Although the need to sharply reduce the range and volume of shipments for state requirements under mandatory orders is recognized, such shipments continue to be too substantial to allow enterprises to swim freely in the commercial ocean. For instance, up to 50 percent of mandatory orders will be kept in the processing industry, and in the extracting industries the figure will be 70 percent of 1990 production levels. Prices for output sales have been allowed to "float" instead of the producers themselves being given their freedom. This time, attempts will be made to fix prices merely for certain resources and consumer goods.

In short, a looming economic crisis can be glimpsed through the misty curtain of the year. After all, the unemployment figure is expected to reach 4 million by the start of the year. It is planned to abolish the old swinging taxes on turnover and sales and to switch to a value-added tax. A social security deduction normative of 37 percent will be applied. The government will introduce a draft law on this.

Supporters of the market are hardly likely to be inspired by the cabinet's cool attitude to the privatization of property. The insertions about denationalization are clearly a compromise. But, on the other hand, something specific has appeared: Half of all the funds produced by denationalization and privatization should be "channeled into clearing the state debt." What kind of state debt? Who decided to do this? The point is that otherwise there could be a temptation to sell off profitable enterprises.

There are many hints in the resolution, and it leaves a lot unsaid: There is no legal clarity. Yet this is very necessary under the conditions of "law wars." And in general it smacks strongly of indicating the only right way out of the crisis, to judge from the tone of the document. Order first, the market later... Time is already running out for some people to submit their documents, others have weeks left. Contracts are necessary, of course; but we know that they have not all been concluded yet, even for this year.

Prime Minister V. Pavlov demanded that the USSR Supreme Soviet give him additional powers to shape the market more rapidly and to enhance the government's organizational role during this very busy period. But in that case the cabinet's "output" should also be "licensed." The government probably also needs to preach the valid principle of a type of contractual relationship with society.

For the time being, people remain ignorant as to just how this sluggish model of the year ahead—a model which had hardly appeared before it was obsolete—will help them.

System 'Breaking Up' as Result of Reforms

PM1906154991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Jun 91 First Edition p 2

["Own Correspondent's Column" by Gennadiy Sazonov: "It Is Not Only Sugar That Breaks Down"]

[Text] Vologda Oblast—The war that latter-day demons are waging against the people is proceeding very successfully. Admittedly it is not bayonets that are being used now but hunger—a powerful instrument for exerting pressure on the conscience. I was staggered recently by a report in the local press that a 55-year-old unemployed man called Tarasov had died of hunger in Cherepovets. Obviously the same fate lies in store for many people who will soon lose their jobs, yet at the same time a privileged elite will become multimillionaires. And these potential men of wealth have already, without delay, deprived the population of the vast Vologda Oblast of the chance of drinking a cup of tea in the morning. Since there is no tea or sugar in the stores for the second month now.

It is well-known that sugar dissolves in water. Likewise our state system is breaking down increasingly rapidly, literally before our eyes, artificially plunged into a brew of sedition, and the people are having to sort things out. Yes, the people, while representatives of the supreme authorities don't bother about them. Just think about it, they argue: The people are lazy and slow and don't have any dollars.

Why is this so? To go on: We have pluralism, after all, including pluralism in sugar. If you steal a bag of sugar from a warehouse or from a store's box room, you are the hero of perestroyka, its hope and support. But if you stay at your workplace or in class teaching children their lessons and don't exchange your ration cards—you have no understanding of perestroyka. That is the extent of sugar pluralism.

But where has the sugar gone—that wretched kilogram which, by Vologda yardsticks, should be provided every month yet has not been since April? I contacted V. Tarasov, deputy chairman of the oblispolkom [oblast soviet executive committee], who is in charge of trade; he recently took on the post.

"The sugar situation is indeed difficult," Vyacheslav Ivanovich said. "We turned to the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Council of Ministers and then to the republic's Ministry of Trade—neither has adopted any decision. The Ukraine should be supplying the lion's share of the product —roughly 8,000 tonnes—but is refusing to do so. We have been issued with licenses, but we cannot attach ourselves to enterprises. I don't know how we are going to overcome the situation. We've sent out a call: Let local enterprises barter what they can."

A market appeal indeed. But what can a teacher, a medic, a musician, or a librarian barter? Books, scalpels, school desks, drums? I will take this opportunity to ask the PRAVDA editorial collegium to allow me as the newspaper's correspondent to exchange my regulation teleprinter or typewriter for the 8kg of sugar that my family is due.

The voice of a drowning man, employed by V. Pozgalev, chairman of Cherepovets City Soviet Executive Committee, to speak to the townspeople, is quite understandable: "It is strange that the RSFSR Government is not monitoring the agreements. Yeltsin has already been to the Ukraine and signed a treaty—it now has to be implemented. The entire republic is suffering! They don't care about us now: They're all fighting the election campaign." I would venture to disagree with the mayor of Cherepovets: They do care about us—they have taken away our breakfast, lunch and dinner are next, and there's also the option of being sold into slavery."

Perhaps the Ukraine is receiving nothing from the Vologda area? V. Osolikhin, chief of an oblispolkom department, denied that. Last year we dispatched lumber, timber, and timber products worth 40 million rubles [R], rolled metal worth R170 million, various kinds of paper worth R12 million, mineral fertilizers worth R42 million, and linen fabrics, jewelry, and cultural-consumer goods worth tens of millions of rubles.

The list is of course by no means complete. There has been virtually no reduction in deliveries this year. However, the oblast soviet and the oblispolkom cannot (or will not) exert any influence on the situation in the interests of the oblast's inhabitants. They say that everything comes from the center, including the center of the RSFSR. Why do we have local organs of power and Communist factions in the soviets if they can do nothing?

And what about the treaty between the RSFSR Government and the Ukraine?

"That is utter fiction, an illusion," Osolikhin commented. "Everyone does what he wants."

There it is, the beloved ideal of perestroyka: Do everything that is not prohibited by law. Under these slogans our state system is breaking up, like a lump of sugar, amid sedition.

Delhi Conference on Aeroflot's Performance Abroad

PM2006083191 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1200 GMT 18 Jun 91

[From the "Television News Service" newscast: Report by S. Alekseyev and A. Zhukov, identified by caption]

[Text] [Announcer] Problems of Aeroflot's offices abroad have been discussed at a conference in Delhi.

[Alekseyev] They included one which we reporters found particularly vexing. Back in the winter we reported on an Indian businessman, Nanaki, who, responding to the food shortages in our country, decided to help with several tonnes of rice and dried milk. It turned out that the freight was still at a Delhi airport depot waiting for a suitable opportunity for dispatch to Moscow. In the end the Ruslan aircraft came to the rescue. But its charter flight to India was pure chance. It emerged that Aeroflot loses hundreds of thousands of rubles every time this huge aircraft flies abroad or around the Union half-empty instead of carrying commercial freight. A lot of this kind of freight is building up at airports, and not just Indian ones.

Incidentally, another reason why the Indian aid to the USSR had not been dispatched is that there is no one to unload it in Moscow. The Sheremetyevo freight handlers are now demanding to be paid in hard currency. So Indian organizations and businessmen who want to help us have to cover these costs too. Problems, more problems... And to cap it all, fares on Soviet flights to India have gone up by almost 300 percent as from April.

[V.S. Yershov, Aeroflot general representative in India, identified by caption] It can be claimed with absolute certainty that Aeroflot aircraft on the Delhi-Moscow-Europe route and the Delhi-Southeast Asia, that is, the Singapore and Kuala Lumpur route, will be booked at the same level as now.

[Alekseyev] Let's hope so. But let us also hope that while resolving its complex departmental tasks and taking care of profit and so forth—the topics discussed at the Delhi conference—Aeroflot will not forget that for thousands upon thousands of people abroad acquaintance with the Soviet Union and their subsequent attitude to it begin precisely with Aeroflot, with the performance, excellent or otherwise, of its air links.

Agricultural

CPSU's Falin Warns of Crop Failure

LD1906180691 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1640 GMT 19 Jun 91

[Text] As CPSU Central Committee Secretary Falin has stated in a speech in Germany, the Soviet Union is threatened this year with a failure of grain and potato crops. At the moment there is the threat of the worst drought of the last 100 years in the Urals and Kazakhstan.

Harvest Prospects Reported

LD1906220891 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 19 Jun 91

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The harvest season has began in many enterprises. Many are worried about the prospects, not only the rural people but also the townsfolk. How we are to feed ourselves and how we are to pass the winter will depend from the kind of harvest we garner. And meanwhile, the harvesting situation is very tense. Here is just one figure: Up to now more than 500,000 machines and tractors remain unrepaired. And this is against the background of this year's weather conditions, which are generally unfavorable for harvesting. There is drought in many regions. So, what are we to expect this year?

[Political observer Artsybachev] By 10 June, vegetables had been sown over an area of 900,000 hectares in the country as a whole, 113,000 hectares less than last year. The difference is rather substantial. No matter how paradoxical this is, alongside with the grain imports Russia has become used to buying ordinary potatoes abroad. We cannot even provide enough of our own seed material. This spring we were about 1 million tonnes short of this. Well, never mind potatoes—is it conceivable to pay $10,000 per kg of tomato, cabbage, or cucumber seed? The agrarian scientsists have immersed themselves in politics, and nobody is engaged in seed research. At the moment potatoes are sown over 1.8 million hectares. This is 400,000 hectares less than last year. One could imagine what will happen in autumn.

Since time immemorial a peasant has most of all been concerned with the grain field. Bread comes before everything, people were saying. And this is true. By 10 June, grain had been sown over 72 million hectares. This is about the same as last year. But I would like to add that part of the autumn grain had to be resown and it is hard to say what will be the result.

While the Ukraine, Krasnodar and Stavropol krays, and Lipetsk, Kursk, and Tambov oblasts give all the promise of full-bodied ears, the outlook for the harvest in central Russia is much more modest. Because of the incessant rains 100,000 hectares fewer were sown in Smolensk Oblast, and almost the same in Tver and in a number of other oblasts. But the situation is the opposite in the Urals, in Kazakhstan, and western Siberia, where there is drought. And this region provides 25 percent of all grain of food-grade variety. There has not been a single drop of rain in Chelyabinsk, Omsk, Novosibirsk, Kustanay, and Kokchetav oblasts for two months. The situation is extraordinary and demands extraordinary measures.

As we see, the situation developing in agriculture today is not simple. If we do not want meager autumn results, those in charge of the agriculture-industrial complex should do all they can to insure that the peasants are not left alone with their problems.

State of Crops Described

PM1806115591 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 15 Jun 91 p 2

[Agrometeorologist N. Korenkova report: "Weather and Crops"]

[Text] Over most of the country's European territory the moderately warm weather and the adequate supply of moisture to the soil have favored the growth and development of most agricultural crops. On the whole, winter crops have formed ears and flowered. In the extreme south of the Ukraine and the southern part of the North Caucasus region wheat and barley have reached the stage of milky ripeness, in the south of Azerbaijan they have reached the stage of waxy ripeness, and in some places the barley is fully ripe. Between 17 and 20 grains have formed per ear of winter wheat, and 30 to 35 grains have formed per ear of rye.

South of a line linking Vinnitsa, Kirovograd, Sumy, Dnepropetrovsk, Rostov-na-Donu, and Volgograd, spring barley has formed ears (within periods close to the long-term average). North of this line there has been stem growth in early spring grain crops. In northern oblasts of the Central and Volga-Vyatka regions and most of the Urals region, spring grain crops have taken root and tillered.

In the Western Ukraine, over most of Belorussia, in the Northwest region and the west and south of the Central region there has been heavy rainfall, and some of the crops have lodged.

Corn has reached the leaf-forming stage. Its development in most of the regions where it is cultivated for grain has fallen behind the long-term average by periods of 10 to 14 days. In the Baltic and the south of the Northwest region shoots have appeared in corn sown for green matter. The plants are developing here within periods close to the long-term average.

In the Baltic, Belorussia, the south of the Northwest region and the north of the Central region, apple and cherry trees are coming to the end of the blossom stage, and south of a line linking Brest, Bryansk, Moscow, and Yoshkar-Ola the formation and growth of fruit has been observed. In the extreme south of the Ukraine and the North Caucasus various varieties of sweet cherries, sour cherries, and apricots have started to ripen.

In the southern half of the Urals region, most crop-growing regions of west Siberia, and northern oblasts of Kazakhstan, early spring grain crops have taken root and tillered. The stems of plants sown early (prior to 15 May) have started to grow, and shoots have appeared in crops sown at the end of May. Winter grain crops have formed ears. Owing to the hot and dry weather which has prevailed over most of this territory for a lengthy period, the conditions for the growth and development of plants were unsatisfactory. The supply of moisture to the crops was inadequate, and in a number of regions it was unfavorable.

In east Siberia shoots have appeared in fields that were sown late. The warm weather that prevailed in the second half of the 10-day period created favorable conditions for crops to take root, and for side shoots to form and grow. The condition of the plants is good on the whole, and the moisture supply is adequate.

Priority Given to Food Processing Projects

PM1806093791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Jun 91 Second Edition pp 1,2

[Unattributed report under "At the USSR Cabinet of Ministers" rubric: "If We Process the Harvest, We Will Get Three Times More Produce"]

[Text] It's an old saw that the harvest is not what's in the field—the harvest is what's on the table. Many countries with risk crops and with a harvest no more abundant than our own manage nevertheless to put far more varied and tasty produce on their citizens' tables. For a long time now, the Soviet Union's system for processing agricultural produce has been hopelessly inadequate. Whereas countries with a developed processing industry achieve a 90-percent rate of delivery to the population, in our country this figure is three times lower.

The use of state-of-the-art technology also has a great influence on the food industry. Such technology allows the United States to supplement the yield from its agricultural sector and deliver 3-3.5 times more produce to consumers' tables. In our country, this "supplement" totals a mere 15-18 percent. Why?

The main reason for this situation is the extreme backwardness of our processing industry's supplies and equipment base. Many meat combines, sugar refineries, and confectionery plants were built before the revolution or during the first five-year plans. Over 40 percent of the equipment employed in food enterprises has already passed its amortization deadline 1.5-2 times over, and one enterprise in every four needs modernizing. However, no more than 4 percent of production equipment is renewed each year. In processing enterprises one employee in three is a manual worker.

As we know, the USSR Government's main decisions for radically modernizing the agro-industrial complex processing sectors were adopted as far back as November 1987. They envisage that by 1995 equipment worth 36.8 billion rubles [R] will be produced and supplied to the agro-industrial complex processing sector—including R9.7 billions' worth from the machine-building complex, R4.4 billion from agro-industrial complex enterprises, and R17.5 million from the defense complex.

A routine USSR Cabinet of Ministers session was devoted to the question of supervising the implementation of these decisions.

It was noted, despite the fact that the defense and machine-building complexes increased equipment production for the agro-industrial complex processing sectors in 1988-90 in line with decisions taken on this question by the USSR government, there has been no qualitative improvement in the supply of modern technology and equipment to these sectors. As before, the growth rate in output of this equipment lags far behind actual demand.

The situation is made worse by the fact that production commitments for individual types of machine and units are not honored, production lines are inadequately equipped, economic contracts are not concluded, and the production of series-produced equipment is halted without the consumer's consent.

In many cases, the defense sectors of industry and the machine-building and agro-industrial complexes are intolerably sluggish in resolving issues to do with developing and introducing the output of new technology, allowing deadlines for completing vital work to be repeatedly postponed. To date the USSR State Committee for Science and Technology, the USSR Agriculture Ministry, and the USSR Finance Ministry have still not solved all the problems of financing scientific research and experimental design work for introducing equipment in 1991.

Unsatisfactory on-site use of equipment supplied for the development and technical refurbishment of the processing sectors of industry is a cause for serious concern. Agro-industrial complex enterprises and construction organizations systematically break deadlines for bringing new equipment into use, and this results in equipment accumulating in storehouses while a significant part of the harvest perishes for want of processing capacity for agricultural produce and does not reach the consumer.

To a large degree this is connected with the fact that the Union republic governments do not pay sufficient attention to solving these problems, nor do they ensure the priority development of processing enterprises and workshops. Thus, as of 1 January 1991 the amount of idle equipment stood at R1.5 billion, which is in fact equal to the annual production of technological equipment for the processing sectors by defense complex enterprises.

The USSR Cabinet of Ministers attaches particular importance to tackling the task of saving as much of the 1991 harvest as possible and thereby establishing the preconditions for improving the supply of foodstuffs to the population, so it considers that this year the efforts of republic and local organs, enterprises and organizations from the agro-industrial complex, construction and assembly organizations and enterprises, and equipment suppliers must be concentrated on ensuring that sufficient power is harnessed to process the greatest possible volume of agricultural produce.

Together with the republic governments, the USSR Ministry of Material Resources, and the supplier ministries the USSR Agricultural Ministry has been given two weeks to draw up a list of agro-industrial complex processing sector units which, taking due account of the real situation, could be used this year for processing agricultural produce from the 1991 harvest and to confirm their schedules for delivering equipment and activating production capacity.

In resolving these questions it must be assumed that, once the corresponding local organs, processing enterprises, and construction organizations have confirmed their readiness to commission production capacities on time, the designated construction projects must be given priority supplies of all the necessary material and technical resources. To realize the task in hand, operations groups comprising representatives of the enterprises under construction, the construction organizations, and the supplier enterprises must be created for each project nearing completion.

USSR Deputy Prime Ministers F.P. Senko and Yu.D. Maslyukov were ordered along with the Union republic governments to monitor the commissioning of capacities due for completion in the current year and settle any questions arising during the equipping of the corresponding projects in an efficient manner.

It is recommended that the Union republic governments examine and resolve questions of the sale or handover to the labor collectives of industrial and other enterprises and organizations of projects constructed using state capital investments for the processing and storage of agricultural produce, on condition that they adopt commitments to ensure that these projects are up and running in the current year, in the event that the original client delays the construction and commissioning of these projects.

F.P. Senko, Yu.D. Maslyukov, V.I. Chernoivanov, and G.B. Stroganov were instructed to work with the Union republic governments to highlight priority aspects in the development and technical refurbishment of the agro-industrial complex processing sectors, bearing in mind that the efforts and resources of equipment developers and manufacturers must be concentrated on ensuring that demand for modern technological equipment in the appropriate sectors is met as fast as possible, to adopt the necessary measures for this, and to forward proposals on any questions requiring USSR government decisions.

It was suggested that the situation regarding the development and organization of the production of machinery and processing equipment output for individual farms and private subsidiary holdings should be examined, and if need be the current program for their production should be amended.

The USSR State Committee for Science and Technology and the USSR Finance Ministry are responsible for resolving the question of financing scientific research and experimental design work for developing equipment for the agro-industrial complex processing sectors in 1991, which was raised at the session by leaders of the ministries for defense sectors of industry, taking due account of USSR Cabinet of Ministers 19 May 1991 Resolution No. 268.

The USSR Ministry of Economics and Forecasting, the USSR Finance Ministry, and the USSR State Council for Economic Reform, with the participation of Union republic governments, are to examine questions raised by the state military and industrial commission and the USSR Agricultural Ministry on the establishment of tax allowances and other economic incentives for enterprises and organizations carrying out design, construction and installation, and startup work at agro-industrial complex processing sector projects, as well as for enterprises and organizations developing and manufacturing technological equipment for the said sectors. Submissions are invited on questions demanding USSR government decisions.

The USSR Cabinet of Ministers took note of a statement by O.I. Lobov, first deputy chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Council of Ministers, to the effect that the republic government in collaboration with the USSR Defense ministry and the Sverdlovsk Oblast Executive Committee is to examine the question of accelerating the commissioning of capacities for producing 10,000 refrigeration units per year at the Serov machinery plant and adopt the necessary measures.

Military

Withdrawal of Troops From Hungary Completed

LD1906190391 Moscow TASS in English 1848 GMT 19 Jun 91

[By TASS correspondent Sergey Zhirnikhin]

[Text] Budapest June 19 TASS—The last Soviet soldier left Hungary today. The Soviet Army's withdrawal from Hungary has been completed two weeks ahead of schedule under the intergovernmental agreement between the two countries reached in the spring of 1990.

Local newspaper reported that a total of 100,000 Soviet Southern Army troops and their families have been evacuated, as well as 27,000 pieces of military equipment and several hundreds of tonnes of various goods.

Hungarians wish Soviet troops well on the whole. The tone was set by the country's leaders—President Arpad Goncz and Prime Minister Jozsef Antall. The Soviet Army's withdrawal restores full independence to Hungary and the Hungarian people must take leave of Soviet soldiers with a friendly handshake, they said. The Hungarian president promised on behalf of his people that the tombs of Soviet soldiers who fell on Hungarian soil during the war against Nazis will be taken care of.

The mass media and the leaders of different political parties have been unanimous in their calls to preserve and strengthen good- neighbourly relations with the Soviet Union. The MAGYAR HIRLAP newspaper summed up the common approach in stressing that owing to the Soviet Army's withdrawal the Soviet Union begins its rightful incorporation into a common European home.

Along with this, the Hungarian press notes that economic problems related to the Soviet Army's withdrawal remain. Moreover, according to Hungarian experts, the positions of the two countries on this score have never been so far apart as they are today. One stumbling block is the sum of compensation for the Soviet Southern Army's installations suitable for civil use. Hungarians say that the ecological damage caused by Soviet troops practically equals the cost of the property left behind by the Soviet Army.

Talks on economic problems between experts from the two countries continue.

Defense Official on Republican Armed Forces

PM1906154091 Moscow IAN MILITARY BULLETIN in English No. 8-9, Apr-May 91 pp 1-3

[Article by Colonel General Vladislav Achalov, USSR Deputy Defense Minister: "A Republican Army in the Conditions of a Union"]

[Text] The idea of establishing republican armed forces has gained wide currency in the Soviet Union of late. Moreover, it is now even legislatively confirmed in the declarations of state sovereignty of a number of union and autonomous republics of the USSR.

In Armenia, Georgia, Moldova and Lithuania practical steps are being taken to establish national armed formations. Whatever they may be called—a regional defence force, a self-defence force of a national guard—their appearance flouts the Constitution of the USSR and the existing legislative acts of the Soviet state. In addition, in the context of the deterioration of inter-nationality relations, even as far as armed clashes, national military formations are an extremely destabilising factor. The armament of such formations is effected mainly by the seizure and theft of weapons. In doing so, grave criminal offences are committed, with the resulting loss of life not only among the military, but also among civilians. It is obvious that such actions are prompted not by the defence interests of republics, but by the political ambitions and selfish aims of separatist forces.

The establishment of republican armed formations is justified by the historical experience, which showed their high "cohesion." National formations really did exist in the Soviet Armed Forces back in the 1920s and 1930s. During the Second World War, formations where the number of servicemen of indigenous nationalities constituted from 30 to 70 per cent played a positive role in the strengthening of friendship between members of the various peoples. But such an approach is unacceptable today. There are several reasons for that.

In shaping national security policy, the state proceeds from a hyopthetical military threat and the real military capabilities of neighbours. The Armed Forces are therefore seen as the guarantor of territorial integrity. In essence, all the republics are half Russian-speaking, with the presence of large nonindigenous population groups. A swift change of the present ethnic situation is unlikely. Consequently, from the outset it is necessary to provide for the establishent of several national formations in the Army or to draft the citizens of all nationalities into it, otherwise you have an obvious case of discrimination. But this rules out a single republican army, being a return to the national-territorial principle, which was forsworn back in 1938. And if all the existing antagonisms among the population are brought into such formations as looks inevitable, the national Armed Forces may themselves become a source of nationalistic extremism.

Since the end of World War II a view of warfare has changed and qualitatively new types of weaponry have appeared. National formations in this context, if a potential enemy has modern destruction means, cannot be expected to offer an assured defence. Will republican armies be able, for example, to repulse an air and space attack or provide the quality training of specialists, to accomplish comprehensively the tasks of technical and other types of support? Will they be fully provided with mobilisation resources and so forth?

Then consider the economic factor. The advocates of the idea of national armed formations assume that small professional armies will be created in the republics. But preliminary estimates show that annual expenditure on the upkeep of personnel signing a contract with the war department, on their combat training, material and technical support as well as lump-sum outlays for the construction of housing and social and cultural facilities will increase by several times compared with the funds allocated for the maintenance of the Soviet Army. Thus, it takes tens of thousands of roubles to train an officer in a military college. The production of combat equipment and weapons in small batches (sometimes—pieces) will bring about a sharp increase in the cost of military output and, possibly, its import. Add to this unavoidable outlays for the creation anbd maintenance of republican defence ministries, staffs and bodies of control. All this will result in enormous and unproductive material and financial expenditures. Lithuania, for example, even with a force of 24,000 men, including 2,300 officers (the number as of May 1940), may have to spend on defence 1.5 billion roubles annually by analogy with the Scandinavian countries (to whose experience they often refer in the Baltic). Given a peacetime Lithuanian army strength of 40,000- 45,000, as its creators plan, the sum could rise to 3 billion roubles. For comparison's sake; Lithuania's annual generated national income in real prices stood at 7.5 to 8.9 billion roubles in 1985-1990. However, considering the development of events inside the country, defence policy will call for an expansion of the powers and responsibility of the republics in the building of the USSR Armed Forces and as regards the formation of the defence budget and the stationing and activity of troops and military installations on their territories. This will also call for a single procedure of conscription, service and the organisation of mobilisation preparation of the economies of the sovereign republics which are part of the union to carry out the main purpose of the Army—the defence of the state. The task of rendering assistance to the bodies of the interior ministry in maintaining public order, taking the country's present sociopolitical situation into account, is an internal function of the USSR Armed Forces. In carrying out these, defence-unrelated tasks, under a procedure set by the Supreme Soviet or the President of the USSR, it is quite legitimate to raise the question of reimbursing the expenditures incurred by the USSR Ministry of Defence, depending on the character of the tasks performed at the expense of the Union budget or the resources of the republic on whose territory army units have had to be used.

Admiral Chernavin Writes on Lessons of War

PM1906161991 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 20 Jun 91 First Edition p 4

[Article by Admiral V.N. Chernavin, commander in chief of the Navy and USSR deputy defense minister: "Bitter Lessons of a Harsh War"]

[Excerpts] It is an axiomatic fact that the military seamen met the first day of the war in full combat readiness. And they were also among the first to open fire on the enemy, on the swastika-painted aircraft moving deep into our country. What was that page of history like? What does it teach us? [passage omitted]

We cannot fail to acknowledge the negative consequences of the fact that military leaders of all levels were really fettered by the order in no circumstances "to provoke the Germans." It must be admitted that the reassuring statements made on behalf of the Soviet Government literally the day before the decisive events disoriented not only a certain sector of the Soviet people but also the Armed Forces themselves. That is why in turning to the events of 50 years ago it is important that we not only see their drama but also that we draw the necessary conclusions from a harsh lesson.

In my view the first conclusion is that the attack of which the leadership of the country and the Armed Forces had advance knowledge was nonetheless a surprise for our troops deployed in the border regions.

Actually, this surprise was not all-encompassing. Indeed, the naval forces, in contrast to the other branches of the Armed Forces, as has already been said, met the enemy's first air attacks in an organized manner and repelled them with virtually no losses. A lot lay behind this. And primarily undoubted credit goes to the leadership of the People's Commissariat of the Navy and the Main Naval Staff, which in the prewar years had engaged most seriously in the problem of preparing for the repulsion of a surprise attack and on the eve of the war took all necessary measures at their own risk. [passage omitted]

From this it seems to me there stems a second lesson: It is not just anyone but the military chiefs and commanders who bear full responsibility to the Fatherland for the maintenance of the forces' vigilance and readiness and for the sober and objective consideration of the real operational-strategic situation.

Our people paid a very high price for their illusions. Boundless faith in the wisdom of the supreme leadership cost us dearly and the voluntary and involuntary underestimation of the threat of the unleashing of war in the early summer of 1941 had grave results. Unfortunately, we can observe something similar even now. Only blind faith in the infinite wisdom of the leader now seems to have been replaced by faith in the boundless possibilities for consolidating the country's security exclusively by political means...

There is no doubt that these means are preferable. Especially today when our society is experiencing a grave crisis. But nor can we fail to see that, as in the past, the overall picture of world development is determined by not one but many tendencies, including directly opposite ones. And present-day examples convincingly attest that the military political situation could develop very rapidly and in an unpredictable direction. That is what has happened in recent years in East Europe, for instance, or in the Persian Gulf.

In this connection I should like to draw attention to a third lesson. Preparation for the country's reliable defense requires many years of building of the Armed Forces. As for the Navy, making good its losses in wartime is virtually impossible. In addition we must always preserve the combat readiness of the Army and Navy at the proper level since they are also an instrument of politics, and a most active instrument. And no one has abolished that situation in the world.

I should like our society today, as always, to realize that maintaining the country's defense at a proper level and maintaining the high combat readiness and combat capability of the Army and Navy are not someone's whim. It is a state necessity. It is an adequate and justified reaction to the realities of the surrounding world. I have in mind also the present real levels of arms. They are immeasurably greater than in 1941. And the consequences of present errors in policy could be considerably graver.

That is why the political and military measures which are being taken today aimed at safeguarding the country's security and maintaining the necessary level of combat readiness and combat capability of the USSR Armed Forces should be as balanced and coordinated as possible. Under the conditions of the transition to a market economy and of the reduction of the Armed Forces any haste in this matter leading to unconsidered decisions is intolerable. Our new military doctrine proceeds from the principle of maintaining a reasonable defensive sufficiency. But here we bear in mind that to ensure constant readiness to repel a surprise attack all branches of our Armed Forces must have a high degree of combat readiness.

And a last point. Wars are waged by peoples. Therefore the country and its people and economy should be ready primarily for any kind of vicissitudes. And that means that the call to vigilance—"remember the war!"—still remains topical.

Military, Naval Reform Prospects Viewed

PM1906154691 Moscow IAN MILITARY BULLETIN in English No. 8-9, Apr-May 91 pp 9-14

[Article by Captain 1st Grade Aleksandr Durnev: "Soviet Navy and Prospects for a Military Reform"]

[Text] The development of the Soviet Armed Forces since the Second World War, which resulted in the attainment of military-strategic parity with the US, eventually prompted the military-political leadership of this country to reform the national defences.

Major decisions concerning the development of the armed forces, training of personnel and their use have been made before, too. In most cases problems were caused by contradictions in the Armed Forces themselves, or by external factors related to the military-political activity of potential opponents. The solution of these problems concerned only some elements of this country's military policy but left intact its essence and fundamental principles. Besides, the policy of constant quantitative and qualitative military build-up, although justified by external reasons, could not last forever due to objective economic laws.

Hence, in these conditions a military reform as a comprehensive programme of changes in the legislative, executive, political, military and other structures of the state should concern nearly all spheres of life.

However, of the great number of changes related to the military reform, the most important of them concern the reform of the Armed Forces, which is impossible without a deep understanding of the specifics of military upgrading, military thought, the current state of the entire defence system of this country, and prospects for its development.

The public has developed a stereotype view on a military reform as a comprehensive and quick reduction of troops and armaments. It is widely believed that a military reform would release major resources, help stabilise the economy and improve the living standards of the people and their welfare while maintaining reliable defences.

Actually, a military reform will call for major outlays. I intend to discuss several points which directly concern allocations on such a reform.

The first is the need for constant technical rearmament. The evolution of weapons has been raising the cost of their production, maintenance and use, while the term of their service life has been dwindling. Experts say that the service life of any weapon system is no longer than five to seven years, while the cost of every new generation of weapons doubles or triples, on an average.

Besides, the creation of new weapon systems usually calls for simultaneous development of auxiliary means and the utilisation of obsolete weapons that are reduced under international agreements. Even the storing of weapons, with the necessary safety provisions, calls for certain outlays, while the creation of ecologically-safe technologies and enterprises for the utilisation and reprocessing of weapons further increase spending. Conversion calls for major expenditures, too.

The second is the withdrawal of troops from some regions, their re-deployment in other regions and provision of the conditions necessary for their life and work, which presupposes the creation of new strategic groups of forces for repelling aggression, as well as the organisation of a system of troop control, logistics, the functioning and technical maintenance of deployment areas and the creation of a new system of training. These major measures also call for additional allocations.

The third is the gradual transition to a professional army, which provides for a change in the system of recruiting and training, organisation of service and social amenities. A professional army of 2.5 million servicemen will annually cost the state three or four times more than it did in 1990.

A realistic assessment and forecasting of the nature and level of military threat is essential to determining the goals of military policy and military reforms. The tasks of the armed forces, the main demands made on personnel, structures, strength, weapons, training and use are determined on the basis of this forecast. This attitude underlies the concept of the Soviet military reform which is being carried out. But there are several factors that influence the elaboration of specific decisions in the sphere of military reform.

The development of the global military-political situation in the next few years will be probably noted for the striving to ease international tensions. But the military threat will persist for a long time yet. In particular, the structure of the armed forces and their weaponry will be improved, which will inevitably put new demands on the reform of the Soviet Armed Forces.

That is why nearly all arms and services of the Soviet Armed Forces will be refurbished within the framework of the military reform. The reform will have certain specifics in the Navy, which is facing problems concerned with development, training, etc.

This above all concerns personnel, the composition of the naval forces, auxiliary services and logistics, organisational and personnel structures, and the military technology policy designed to improve the quality of the Navy. Besides, plans for the training and use of fleets, the provision of equipment for certain regions and zones of their operation, as well as the system of recruiting and training personnel and mobilisation resources of the Navy will have to be reviewed. Of great importance for the success of the reform will be the creation of a mechanism of social protection of servicemen and the improvement of the living and working conditions of naval personnel. The decision on experimenting with contractual service in the Navy has become the first step to a professional army.

The creation of a modern Navy should spotlight the construction of better ships, weapons and equipment, as well as the improvement of the control system and auxiliary services and logistics, with the simultaneous planned elimination of obsolete and ineffective ships. But it is impossible to improve the Navy in the current dramatic economic conditions.

Hence, the task of the day is to choose the right priorities. In the current conditions we should probably focus our attention on the development and improvement of naval strategic nuclear forces and their infrastructure as the main deterrence factor.

Changes in the composition and strength of the Navy and the re-distribution of tasks between naval services call for the improvement of organisational and personnel structures of formations, units and control bodies of the Navy proper, as well as its auxiliary and logistics units.

The goal of this improvement of the organisational and personnel structures is to guarantee constant combat readiness of the Navy and the best possible use of its armaments and equipment.

The essence of the improvement of organisational structures is to reduce the number of units and gear their composition and strength to new tasks, to strengthen auxiliary and logistics units, to overhaul peacetime control systems to be able to fulfil wartime tasks, and to rationalise the structure of naval research and training establishments. The above measures will be carried out gradually, so as to maintain combat readiness at the necessary level.

The naval reform also provides for a considerable reduction in the number of ship and naval aviation units, a change in the control system, and the creation of full-blooded auxiliary and logistics units in the centre and in the fleets.

In general, the composition, types and qualitative characteristics of ships and weapons and equipment provided to them during the reform, correspond to the tasks facing the Navy under the current defensive doctrine. But qualitative changes in the Navy (the development of new ships, weapons and equipment) can be guaranteed only if accompanied by the provision of bases and maintenance and repair facilities and the improvement of training.

The restructuring of the system of naval training and a review of the personnel policy are the key questions of the reform. The personnel problem is burdened by the so-called Vietnamese syndrome. If we do not overcome it soon, neither technical rearmament nor organisational changes will improve combat readiness, to saying nothing of keeping it at the present level.

This means that the ultimate goal of the change in the recruiting system and the training and personnel policies should be to fight the negative attitude to combat duty and service in general, and to create conditions for a gradual transition to a professional Navy.

In order to attain this goal in line with the planned reform of the Navy, we should specify the possible future demands for personnel of all classes, military professions, and the level and sphere of training, and use this information to restructure naval training, gradually going over to a professional (contractual) naval service based on legal norms of mutual obligations of servicemen and officials. The organisational and personnel restructuring of the Navy and the reduction of its strength should be accompanied by the provision of social guarantees and should not infringe on the vital interests of all classes of servicemen.

At present and in the next few years, the exterritorial principle of general conscription, which guarantees the necessary combat and mobilisation readiness, will remain the key principle of naval development. But with time we shall gradually introduce a system of recruiting volunteers for all categories of naval service.

The realisation of the above measures will call for additional allocations on the maintenance and all-round provision of servicemen.

Naturally, the naval reform will proceed withint eh framework, and will keep to the schedule, of the general military reform, whose success will depend on political and economic stability of this country as a united, renewed federal state. A vital condition for the military reform is legal safeguards for a mechanism of taking decisions on all questions of the state's military policy, and carrying them out.

If we fail to create such a mechanism and to stabilise the political and economic situation in the country, the military reform will skid, piling up problems and eventually bringing down the combat capabilities of the army and the Navy.

Reform Problems Viewed

PM1906154291 Moscow IAN MILITARY BULLETIN in English No. 8-9, Apr-May 91 pp 4-8

[Article by Professor Vitaliy Tsygichko, Doctor of Engineering: "Current Problems and Future Prospects of Soviet Military Reform"]

[Text] The London declaration of the NATO session has put paid to the Cold War. There are gradually emerging political, economic, legal and other principles of a new and civilised system of international security. In the current world situation, a massive cut in Soviet military might becomes imperative. Such a cut is also necessitated by domestic political and economic processes taking place in the USSR. It is obvious that without cardinal reduction of military expenses and without the defence industry going over to the production of civilian goods, it is practically impossible to pull out of the economic crisis.

Moreover, in the Armed Forces there are serious reasons for transforming their organisation. To begin with, there are social and economic problems. But even purely military matters, for example, of technical re-equipment and modernisation of the armed forces and their structures, of forms and methods of military planning, have recently become particularly acute. These problems had existed for a long time already, but the drama is that the country is not prepared to reduce and reorganise its armed forces today.

The reason is that, first, the country's leadership is not ready for the solution of these problems, since it does not have a real concept of how to ensure the country's security at the present state, nor a scientifically based programme of action in this area.

Second, there is no political basis—no Union treaty that would legislatively determine the status of the armed forces, principles of a military budget, and a new military system of the state.

Third, there is no social and economic basis for defense transformations.

The task of demilitarising the country, which is bound to entail deep cuts in the Army, conversion of defence production and problems in arms reductions, will require enormous sums of money and material resources. The state today is, for example, unable to provide all released officers and warrant officers with housing and jobs. This increases the dissatisfaction of servicemen with their present position and prospects. So heavy cuts in the Armed Forces may lead to even greater social and political tensions in society. Besides, large funds will be required to prevent and clean up the negative ecological effects of military activities and disarmament processes. This applies in the first place to the destruction of chemical and other kinds of mass destruction weapons.

A further point to note is that by concluding an agreement to cut back troops and arms, the Soviet leadership failed to take into account the actual capabilities of the Soviet armed forces and economy in effecting such cuts. Some of the obligations assumed cannot be fulfiled on schedule or lead to extreme situations. One example is the withdrawal of troops from Eastern Europe, when units being withdrawn do not have prepared sites of stationing in the USSR. A similar situation exists with respect to the treaty on the abolition of chemical weapons when the schedules assumed by the Soviet side cannot be physically kept to. Thus, in the conditions of the crisis being experienced by this country, the urgent military reform appears to lack any economic backing.

Fourth, the high command of the Soviet Armed Forces is not ready and, perhaps, does not want cardinal changes in defence organisation. These changes may alter the status of the armed forces, reduce drastically their supreme commander corps and introduce society's control over military planning and military activities. All this may result in the loss of the military's present influence on the foreign policy of the country. Also, the military are mostly orthodox Communists who are committed to the discredited idea of the Party's apparatus, which is objectively opposed to democratic change and has been organising legal opposition and exerting a permanent pressure on the country's president.

The involvement of the Armed Forces in internal political struggle has been a practical result of their policy. The tragic events in which Armed Forces participated are widely known. Naturally, the political position of the military leadership is also fully reflected on its approach to a military reform.

All the same, domestic objective circumstances and also the international political and military-political situation call for a military reform even in the current unfavourable conditions. Actually, the reform has already begun. Everyone knows of unilateral cuts made by the Soviet Union in its armed forces. There are to be troop and arms cuts under European treaties and a 50 per cent reduction of strategic nuclear forces. Military production is already being curtailed, and its conversion is only just the initial stage of forthcoming cardinal transformations in the Armed Forces.

Arguments over the nature of a military reform, however, do not cease. Alternative proposals are being made by the right and the left, the centre and the republics. There are already draft concepts submitted by the General Staff of the Armed Forces, the radical wing of middle-ranking officers and a number of constituent republics. What is known as the "nine plus one" statement attempted to delimit the influence on the armed forces between the centre and the republics. We think, however, that a legal and economic basis for adopting and implementing some concept of military reform can only be built after the conclusion of a Union treaty. It is already clear that none of the concepts offered will avoid being greatly modified to take into account in more detail the positions held above all by the republics.

Republican concepts of national security are currently being drafted. In Russia such a concept already exists. It is based on human security and human rights. Consideration is given to the personal, social, legal, economic, cultural and other aspects of security of Russia's citizens. The concept further includes questions of organising the defense of the sovereignty of the republic and defense of the country against an external threat.

Practically all republics, with the exception of the Baltic republics and Georgia, are prepared to turn over the defence of the country to the jurisdiction of the union government and the Supreme Soviet. But views of the republics on the principles of forming the country's military budget, on the status and tasks of the Armed Forces, on the forms of military planning and staffing the Army, the order of serving and other questions of organisation of defence differ greatly from each other.

Serious differences are due above all to the narrow nationalist approach by some republics to matters of defence, ignoring the interests of the state as a whole and in the final analysis infringing on the interests of other republics, especially Russia, which bears the main burden of expenses. Thus, some republics are demanding that their citizens should do military service only on the territory of the republic concerned. Others do not want to have troops and military installations stationed on their territories. Some request a transition to a national-territorial structure of the Armed Forces. There are serious differences also with regard to the principles of determining a financial contribution by the republics to the country's military budget. Demands are put forward, such as participation of republics in controlling the armed forces. At the same time, practically all agree that the military budget should be substantially cut, by 50 to 60 per cent. Other tasks include at least a 50 per cent cut in the army strength, transition to professional armed forces recruited from volunteers, and improvements in the social standing of servicemen. All republics favour a large measure of openness on defence, greater control over the military leadership and democratisation of army life. A consensus on these fundamental issues raises hope that the existing contradictions will be overcome as the Union treaty is formed.

The concept of a military reform, worked out by the General Staff and recently published in the press, may be taken as a departure document for deciding on a new military system. It ought to be noted that the concept assumed its final shape following the joint work by its compilers with members of various commissions of the USSR Supreme Soviet and individual deputies and experts. On the whole the concept reflects new approaches, modern trends and views on the country's defence, and the principles of military planning. It assess sufficiently soberly the country's potential for modernisation of the Armed Forces and their gradual transition to a professional level.

At the same time, we believe that not enough attention has been given in the concept to questions of openness and control over all aspects of defence activities. The section dealing with the social protection of servicemen should be more detailed.

It should also be good if the military and political doctrine could be openly discussed and adopted by the

USSR Supreme Soviet, with due account taken of the opinions of the republics and most population of the country. The doctrine should lay down long-term guidelines for forming an annual military budget. The chairman of the Supreme Soviet should draw up annual reports on state priorities in defence and tasks of the Armed Forces on the basis of a current assessment of the military and political situation and its short- term and long-term forecasts. Such a report could provide grounds for a military budget, which could be adopted item by item by the Supreme Soviet. The adoption of a budget should, in our view, be preceded by thorough work to substantiate and explain it to legislators and to the public of the country. It would be highly useful if disinterested experts and organisations could make a scientific evaluation of a draft budget. Such openness and predictability would have a positive effect on the international situation as a whole.

French Officer Impressed by Western Group Flier

PM1906164591 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 14 Jun 91 First Edition p 3

[Colonel V. Markushin report: "Visit to Western Group of Forces"]

[Text] Corps General N. Shazaren [name as transliterated], commander in chief of the French troops in Germany, has paid a reciprocal visit to the Western Group of Forces at the invitation of Colonel General M. Burlakov, commander in chief of the Western Group of Forces. The guest and those accompanying him were briefed on the tasks being resolved by the group's troops under the conditions of their systematic withdrawal to the Soviet Union. They were acquainted with the Soviet servicemen's life and routine, attended tactical exercises, and inspected models of combat hardware.

In a brief conversation with KRASNAYA ZVEZDA's correspondent following demonstration flights at Sperenberg Airfield Gen. N. Shazaren spoke highly of the flight personnel training:

"From what I have seen, I am impressed with the professionalism of people who have mastered combat hardware to perfection. It is a very, very strong impression. I was struck, in particular, by the skill of the pilot who demonstrated the potential of the MiG-29."

I will name our pilot: It was Lieutenant Colonel Vladimir Shilin.

No Easy Alternative to Military Service Allowed

PM1906134191 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 15 Jun 91 First Edition p 1

["Direct Line" report by unnamed RIA correspondent: "...But It Won't Be Any Easier"]

[Text] A draft law on alternative civilian service for draftees has been submitted for examination by the USSR Supreme Soviet. According to the draft, people who cannot serve in the Army because of their religious or other beliefs will have the right to perform this kind of service. A. Sebentsov, chairman of a subcommittee of the parliamentary Legislation and Law and Order Committee, announced that alternative service would not be easier than military service, in order to avoid causing an artificial exodus from the USSR Armed Forces.

Shlyaga Defends Army's Military-Political Bodies

PM1906153591 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 18 Jun 91 First Edition p 2

[Correspondent Lieutenant Colonel N. Poroskov report: "In Reform Conditions"]

[Text] A meeting of chiefs of air defense unit military-political bodies has been held. Colonel General N. Shlyaga, chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff Main Military-Political Directorate and USSR first deputy defense minister, took part in and made a speech at the "round table" talks devoted to the future of the military reform. He viewed the attacks made on military-political bodies in some of the mass media as an attempt to tear the spiritual core out of military structures. Today it is first of all essential to fulfill the new demands made on military-political bodies in a professional and juridically correct fashion.

Colonel General N. Shlyaga called on those participating at the meeting not to avoid political debates and to get closer to the people.

I. Kovyrin, a senior official in the CPSU Central Committee, and Lieutenant General A. Gorbachev, chief of the Main Military-Political Directorate's Social and Legal Work Directorate, took part in the work of the meeting.

Report on Sale of Missile Cruiser Abroad Denied

PM2006085191 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 14 Jun 91 First Edition p 2

[TASS report: "They Were in a Hurry to 'Sell'"]

[Text] The INTERFAX news agency and KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA were in a hurry to sell the missile cruiser Vladivostok abroad by reporting a "deal" which had supposedly taken place. In reality the ship is still lying at a berth in the Far East Shipyard.

"This is a case where agencies of various kinds have passed off dubious rumors as a verified fact," Rear Admiral A. Loyko, chief of the Pacific Fleet's rear services, believes. "The cruiser Vladivostok is on the list of ships being prepared to be written off. But its fate and whether it will be sold abroad still have to be decided. By decision of the Navy's commander in chief, the large antisubmarine ship Tallinn has received the name Vladivostok."

Baltic Republics

'Government Crisis' Averted in Estonia

LD1906152691 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1500 GMT 19 Jun 91

[Text] Our correspondent reports from Tallinn: It was with great difficulty that a government crisis was averted in Estonia today. Twenty six deputies of the Republican Supreme Soviet demanded the government's resignation. After Arnold Ruutel, chairman of the Estonian Supreme Soviet, spoke at the session, however, the issue was not included in the agenda.

Deputy Lists Estonian Government's 'Faults'

LD1806094291 Tallinn Radio Tallinn Network in Estonian 0600 GMT 18 Jun 91

[Text] As is known, 26 Supreme Soviet deputies yesterday presented a statement which requested that, as a matter of urgency, a draft resolution on releasing the chairman of the government from his post be included on the Supreme Soviet agenda. Today the Supreme Soviet Presidium will convene on this matter. The Supreme Soviet board and leaders of deputy groups are also invited to its session. The press has published the names of the deputies who signed the statement. It is noteworthy that not one Russian deputy has signed the statement. One of those who signed, Tonis Mets of the Republican Party, has published in PAEVALEHT today his view of the causes for the government conflict. In his opinion what have been the government's major faults? First, the government has been rigidly seeking an economic solution either in the East or in the West while forgetting about development focused on Estonia. In an eager wave of setting up joint-stock companies, places for entertainment, and bistros the situation is such that one cannot even buy an ordinary nail in the stores. Second, the government has not been adapting local industry to the domestic market. Third, there is agriculture. The author claims that the government's uncaring attitude toward agriculture has resulted in a catastrophic reduction in the number of farm animals. The government is also reproached for its wages and prices policy.

So, Tonis Mets deems it likely that the government will fall. But who will form the next government? Tonis Mets names quite a few people: Ulo Nugis, Ulo Uluots, Tiit Vahi, and Rein Miller.

Concluding his article, Tonis Mets pays tribute to Savisaar [chairman of the government] for what he has done and states that Savisaar is far from having said his last word on shaping Estonian politics. But in Mets' opinion, replacing the present government would benefit the Estonian people and the developing Estonian state.

Estonians Dissatisfied With Government Policy

PM1906155991 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 14 Jun 91 Union Edition p 1

[BALTFAX report from the "IZVESTIYA, TASS, INTERFAX, BALTFAX, BALTIJA, REUTERS" column: "Estonian Peasant Unions Do Not Trust the Government"]

[Text] The Rural Union, the Central Producers Union, and the Union of Rural Trade Unions, which unite all Estonia's peasants, have expressed their lack of confidence in the Edgar Savisaar government. The reason is the peasants' dissatisfaction with policy in the agricultural sphere, BALTFAX reports.

It was announced at a joint conference of the three peasant unions that this year meat production has fallen by 30 percent and milk production by 20 percent. In the first quarter of 1991 wages increased on average by 150 rubles [R] in industry, and by R2.30 in agriculture.

Latvia To Privatize State, Collective Farms

LD2006083591 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 0600 GMT 20 Jun 91

[Text] The Latvian Council of Ministers has adopted a decision to hand over state and collective farm property to independent ownership. The number of facilities due to be handed over will evidently amount to many thousands. Experts believe the process will be beset by various difficulties. Questions of finance will arise because the town, rayon, and volost [small rural district] authorities will hardly be able to maintain these facilities with their own forces, and it is believed that many unprofitable facilities will simply have to be tied to the self-government bodies.

Landsbergis Says Treaty With Russia Possible

LD1906180291 Moscow TASS in English 1727 GMT 19 Jun 91

[By correspondent Aleksandras Budris]

[Text] Moscow June 19 TASS—Head of the Lithuanian Parliament Vytautas Landsbergis said in a TASS interview today that Russia and Lithuania could sign a bilateral agreement as early as this summer. He spoke to TASS during a stopover in Moscow on his way to Paris.

Landsbergis made this statement after meeting early today Ruslan Khasbulatov, deputy chairman of the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet. The Lithuanian president said the meeting focused on prospects for bilateral relations and noted the importance of concluding the agreement between Russia and Lithuania as early as possible. According to him, exchanging missions with Russia would ease the solution of many problems, including those linked with "the complaints by certain citizens from Lithuania" which are addressed directly to the Russian Parliament.

Landsbergis welcomed the recent proposal by Kazakh President Nursultan Nazarbayev to hold a meeting between the leaders of 15 republics of the Soviet Union minus central authorities. At the same time the head of the Lithuanian Parliament chided the Kazakh leader for what he called "a diplomatic indiscretion" and stressed that "the Baltic countries were never part of the USSR on a legal basis".

Speaking about the forthcoming visit to France, Landsbergis said his main goal was "to continue and extend contacts that started in October last year". The programme of the current visit includes meetings with French President Francois Mitterrand, Prime Minister Edith Cresson, parliament deputies, businessmen, and leaders of several southern departments of France.

Landsbergis will also discuss prospects for Lithuanian involvement in the European process and bilateral cooperation. He is expected to discuss prospects for opening a French cultural centre in Lithuania and a Lithuanian representative office in France.

According to Landsbergis, such an office, without an official diplomatic status, can tackle some political issues, specifically aiding Lithuanian youths who "dodge military draft and find themselves in various European countries".

Landsbergis on Baltic Republics CSCE Role

LD1906123391 Berlin ADN in German 1102 GMT 19 Jun 91

[Text] Moscow (ADN)—Lithuanian President Vytautas Landsbergis has spoken critically of the role accorded the Baltic republics at the CSCE council session in Berlin. Before starting a nine-day journey through several European countries he stated to ADN today: "Setting up barriers such as the CSCE foreign ministers' conference in Berlin and elsewhere is outdated. It is not in accordance with the times and with the promises made by the Soviet Union. My journey has to make a contribution toward finally overcoming these artificial barriers."

Landsbergis will visit France, Norway, Germany, and Finland. He will be received in Paris by President Francois Mitterand and Prime Minister Edith Cresson. "The aim of my visit to France is to restore links to that country's leadership," Landsbergis said. "Possibilities of French support for Lithuania will be discussed, including the sphere of diplomatic relations. The establishment of cultural centers in Vilnius and Paris will be discussed. I am hoping for concrete political, economic, and cultural benefits for our republic." His journey is also to remind the states that Lithuania is conducting active policies in Europe.

In Kiel, the capital of Schleswig-Holstein, the Lithuanian politician will take part in a meeting of parliamentarians from the Nordic countries and will meet Social Democratic Party, Christian Democratic Union, and Free Democratic Party representatives in the Landtag [regional parliament]. In Tonsberg in Norway, Landsbergis will be a guest at the opening of a Lithuanian music festival. On his return journey to Vilnius he intends to take part in a meeting on the future of the Baltic republics in Helsinki along with his counterparts from Latvia and Estonia.

During a stopover in Moscow today Landsbergis met the deputy Russian parliamentary president, Ruslan Khasbulatov.

Landsbergis Goes to Scandinavia, France, Germany

LD1906155891 Vilnius Radio Vilnius Network in Lithuanian 1300 GMT 19 Jun 91

[Text] A delegation from the Republic of Lithuania led by Supreme Council Chairman Vytautas Landsbergis left for France, Norway, Germany, and Finland today. During the nine-day trip the delegation will meet leaders and representatives of political parties and other officials in each country. Tomorrow, the delegation will meet French President Francois Mitterrand, the new Prime Minister Edith Cresson, Senate Chairman Alain Poher, National Assembly Chairman Lorrent Fabius, and Culture Minister Jack Lang.

Vytautas Landsbergis and Grazina Landsbergis will take part in the opening of the festival of Lithuanian music in the Norwegian town of Sonsberg.

The Lithuanian delegation will participate in the annual rally of the parliaments of the Nordic countries in Kiel, Germany. The delegation will also visit the European Parliament in Strasbourg. On 27 June the Lithuanian delegation will arrive in Helsinki where the meeting of members of parliament of the Baltic countries and the Soviet Union, organized by the parliamentary assembly of the European Council, will take place.

Before the trip, Vytautas Landsbergis was interviewed at Vilnius airport by radio and television correspondents of independent Lithuania.

The aim of this visit is to renew ties with the leaders of France, to advance the solution of the issues discussed during my first visit to Paris in the autumn of last year, said V. Landsbergis. The possibilities of various aid in specific areas which France could offer to Lithuania will be discussed, while slowly moving forward in the sphere of diplomatic links. Now, we are talking specifically about the French culture center in Vilnius and about an office representing us in Paris. The solution of financing and other problems should be completed during this visit. We shall also visit the southern areas, where the local government is interested in maintaining economic, production and trade links with Lithuania. We need all this and I expect a specific political, economic, and cultural benefit to our Republic.

I will spend next weekend at meetings in Norway and Germany. These will be brief visits with very specific cultural and political content. On the way back, I have to visit Helsinki where the three chairmen of the Baltic states have been invited to a working political meeting. The Soviet Union and we will be looking for solutions for independence, Landsbergis said.

Assessing his visit in the context of the meeting of European foreign ministers in Berlin, Vytautas Landsbergis pointed out to the ELTA correspondent that his delegation will emphasize again that there is a state of Lithuania with an active policy in Europe, which is returning to Europe. An artificial setting up of barriers in Berlin or anywhere else is an obsolete idea which does not correspond to modern times and the promises made by the Soviet Union, Landsbergis stressed. The current visit should help ensure that finally the artificial barriers of Europe can be overcome, he added.

Landsbergis Interviewed on Independence

AU1906183491 Warsaw ZYCIE WARSZAWY in Polish 17 Jun 91 pp 1, 6

[Interview with Lithuanian President Vytautas Landsbergis by Tadeusz Bardzo in Vilnius; date not given: "There Is No Other Way"]

[Text] [Bardzo] I monitored the events in Lithuania in the first few days of June from neighboring Latvia. The Latvians reacted to the new show of strength by the Soviet Army with great concern, but without undue alarm. What do you say to that?

[Landsbergis] Perhaps we have grown accustomed to this permanent threat.

[Bardzo] Is that your explanation for the reaction of the Latvians?

[Landsbergis] I would not say they reacted with indifference. That same evening I received several telephone calls from Latvia. President Gorbunovs and Prime Minister Godmanis both phoned. They were very worried.

[Bardzo] Moscow's explanation for all this sounds odd, to say the least. It said that the latest action in Lithuania is in accordance with military regulations. What kind of constitution recognizes human rights and yet places military regulations above these rights?

[Landsbergis] This matter was resolved after the January events, when so-called urban patrols were introduced in Lithuania. At that time we even applied to the Supervisory Constitutional Committee of the Soviet Union to investigate the matter. One month later they replied that these patrols are against the Constitution and cannot be implemented without a prior declaration of a state of emergency, and we have had no state of emergency. I need not mention the fact that from a legal point of view, Lithuania is not subject to Soviet law. Therefore both Pugo and Yazov were accused of violating the constitution.

[Bardzo] But following the April declaration by the leaders of nine republics and Gorbachev, do you see any change in the attitudes of the center? After all, that declaration gave the green light for a federation.

[Landsbergis] That is what one can assume, and perhaps that will be a way out. In any case, the Kremlin will recognize an independent Lithuania one way or another. When the Kremlin does so, we will not say it has lost. Everyone will have won. But perhaps they do not understand that in Moscow yet.

[Bardzo] How do you think the transitional period should look? The Latvians are suggesting that politics should not be mixed with economics.

[Landsbergis] I do not see how we can avoid mixing politics with economics in our situation. If that is what they suggest, it means they themselves will implement their politics solely via the economy. That is possible, but will it be effective?

[Bardzo] I have heard from the very lips of Latvian President Gorbunovs an idea Mrs. Prunskiene made even clearer in an interview for NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA, that as long as there is no all-union accord, Moscow is not a credible partner for talks, but will only be credible after this agreement has been concluded. Do you agree?

[Landsbergis] From a legal point of view, things will be different, the situation will change. But if they refuse to hold talks, we will continue our present line of conduct. However, the balance of forces in the Kremlin leadership may make us alter our conduct.

[Bardzo] In that case, do you consider Yeltsin and his policies conducive to the independence of the Baltic republics?

[Landsbergis] I have no reason to think otherwise. I have not heard of any changes in this sphere.

[Bardzo] Privatization has started in Lithuania. How does it work?

[Landsbergis] It mainly involves a changeover to private ownership of the factors of production. The point is for everyone to possess something and be able to buy a share in or contribute to a company or farm, or even buy the apartment he lives in. In a nutshell, the point is to finally gain ownership of the things we have worked for during the decades since we were stripped of ownership rights by the Soviet state. We have now started moving in that direction. Whoever wants to can invest in his apartment and buy it for rubles. Money deposited in a bank will be immune to inflation and will earn interest. A citizen and family may choose what to invest in.

As far as the market and market changes are concerned, these changes are also taking place. Price controls are still in force in Lithuania, even though prices are increasing all the time. There have been suggestions of releasing all price controls; I think it dangerous to do so all at once. It should be done in stages in the course of one year.

[Bardzo] Land reform is also being prepared in Lithuania, and questions concerning land ownership are being settled. Will land be returned to its former owners, including Poles?

[Landsbergis] We not discriminating concerning nationality. Nevertheless, our parliament has resolved that anyone due to receive land must have Lithuanian citizenship, to which anyone who was born in Lithuania or living in Lithuania at the time of this law's adoption six months ago is entitled. However, restrictions apply not just to citizenship, but also to the size of the land—up to 50 hectares. We also want to make people in this category work on the land. A debate is in progress on how to deal with people who are not working on the land but would nevertheless like to claim their property.

[Bardzo] Do you think there is a likelihood of a Polish autonomous region in an independent Lithuania? In particular I would like you to comment on the recent meeting of local government representatives in Mosciszki, where a plan to set up a Polish region was adopted.

[Landsbergis] Everything should be examined in accordance with the constitution and legislation. Legislation is passed by the Supreme Soviet, not by some local government body or group of local governments representatives. I think this topic has been exaggerated. Someone is trying to stir emotions. We know that the Soviets have been playing a certain political game. They are trying to create conflicts, but they will not succeed. We will not succumb to provocation. As far as I know, a Polish flag was even flown from some office, which would not be allowed in any country. We tend to disregard this, and trust that Poland will react to this and prevent Polish flags from being flown for this purpose.

[Bardzo] How are your contacts with the Polish Government and politicians?

[Landsbergis] On a personal level, very good.

[Bardzo] And as head of state?

[Landsbergis] I would like to see more progress. There was more of it in the past. There was a joint declaration waiting to be signed, but something went wrong. A Lithuanian policy was missing.

[Bardzo] After several months as head of state, are you still optimistic about Lithuanian full independence?

[Landsbergis] I have always been an optimist. There is no other way.

Lithuanian Official Telegrams Pugo, Doguzhiyev

OW2006032391 Moscow BALTFAX in English 0930 GMT 19 Jun 91

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] On Tuesday Deputy Prime Minister of Lithuania Zigmas Vaisvila sent telegrams to two Soviet leaders.

The first telegram addressed to USSR Deputy Prime Minister Vitaliy Doguzhiyev expresses concern over "the state of discipline and law and order in Soviet military units stationed in Lithuania". The telegram says servicemen "frequently commit crimes" and, as an example, describes the June 18 incident when a serviceman Tolmachev using robbed arms killed two persons near the city of Klaipeda, took their car and later broke it.

"We are hopeful that the Soviet government will take measures to establish order in Soviet military units for June ruling out the posibility of such grave crimes", the telegram emphasizes.

The second telegram addressed to USSR Interior Minister Boris Pugo condemns the ongoing "unlawful terrorist actions by Soviet OMON special force against citizens, home defense and customs servicemen of the Lithuanian Republic". The telegram was sent after yesterday's (June 18) OMON's attack on the Lithuanian customs posts Vegeryai on the border with Latvia which left 6 Lithuanian border guards severely beaten and the post burnt down.

"The Lithuanian government strongly protests against the attacks and demands that arbitrary actions by Soviet OMON [Special Purpose Milita Detachment] be immediately stopped", the telegram points out.

Lithuanian Views Soviet Troop Action 3 Jun

OW2006032291 Moscow BALTFAX in English 0930 GMT 18 Jun 91

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] In an interview with the newspaper "Lietuvos Aidas" Nikolai Medvedev, USSR people's deputy representing Lithuania, commented on actions taken by Soviet troops near the Lithuanian parliament building June 3.

As BF [BATLFAX] reported earlier, on Jun 3 numerous military posts were established in the capital of Lithuania. Groups of armed soldiers were deployed not far from the parliament building.

N. Medvedev believes taking these actions the military sought to achieve several goals. The first goal was to look at Lithuania's reaction and assess the possibility of a coup. Second, to see how fast and effectively can Vilnius be blockaded. Third, to check Russia's and the West's reaction. N. Medvedev notes that "there was a big public outcry everywhere, therefore, the actions will have serious consequences", The fourth aim was, as he put it, "to spoil the laureate garland of Gorbachev" (the Nobel Peace Prize—BF).

N. Medvedev argues that the actions were part of the "Soyuz" group's program. He says that this program has not exhausted yet and that "we should keep a vigil".

"Yeltsin's victory in the election diminished a little the threat of a coup", he says.

Baltic Communist Parties on Human Rights

OW2006023091 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1500 GMT 19 Jun 91

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Representatives of Baltic Comunist Parties attending the Berlin conference as members of non-governmental organizations have issued a statement alleging human rights violations in the Baltic Republics.

The statement says that the crisis in the region has led a spate of human rights violations and charges the authorities of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania with pursuing a policy of ideological and ethnic discrimination. The statement says hundreds of thousands of people have been discriminated against.

Representatives of the CPs of the Baltic republics declared on behalf of the Baltic Inter-Parliamentary Council, which brings together the MPs of the three republics supporting the USSR in its present form, that ethnically insular totalitarian regimes persecuting dissent are formed in the Baltics in the guise of democrtization and the restoration of independence

The statement claims that the Baltic republics are glorifying Nazism and are out to review the course and results of WWII.

The statement signed by L. Annus and P. Yermoshkin (CP, Estonia), A. Klautsens and I. Yagunets (CP, Latvia), and L. Yankelevich (CP, Lithuania) called on the Berlin conference to support "the effort of the national USSR government and President Gorbachev to preserve an integral and renewed Soviet Federation as a guarantor of peace, secrity, and stability in Europe and the world at large".

According to BF's [BALTFAX] correspondent in Berlin representatives of the Baltic CPs will give anews conference in Berlin on June 19. According to unconfirmed reports the Foreign Ministers of the Baltic republics will give a news conference on June 20 at 15:00.

RSFSR

TASS Carries Final RSFSR Election Results

LD1906220391 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1521 GMT 19 Jun 91

[Text] Having considered protocols received from district election commissions on the results of voting at the elections for Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] president on 12 June 1991, the Central Election Commission summed up the final results on 19 June.

There were 106,484,518 citizens entered on the lists of the 88 electoral districts established on the territory of the republic; 79,498,240 electors, or 74.66 percent of the total, took part in the voting.

Six RSFSR presidential candidates were included on the voting papers for secret ballot. As a result of the elections, the votes were divided in the following way:

	For Candidate	Percent	Against Candidate	Percent
Bakatin, Vadim Viktorovich	2,719,757	3.42	75,061,726	94.42
Yeltsin, Boris Nikolayevich	45,552,041	57.30	32,229,442	40.54
Zhirinovskiy, Vladimir Volfovich	6,211,007	7.81	71,570,476	90.03
Makashov, Albert Mikhaylovich	2,969,511	3.74	74,811,972	94.10
Ryzhkov, Nikolay Ivanovich	13,395,335	16.85	64,386,148	80.99
Tuleyev, Aman-Geldy Moldagzyyevich	5,417,464	6.81	72,364019	91.03

There were 1,525,410 voting papers, or 1.92 percent of the total quantity of voting papers issued, in which the names of all candidates were crossed out, and 1,716,757 voting papers, or 2.16 percent, were deemed invalid.

Because of irregularities during the elections and the vote count, the Central Electoral Commission deemed the voting results at polling station No. 389 of Leningrad Oblast electoral district and polling station No. 1904 of Novosibirsk electoral district to be invalid but this did not affect the election results.

In accordance with Article 15 of the RSFSR Law "On the Election of the RSFSR President," Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin, born in 1931, chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, was elected RSFSR president. In the elections he received more than half of the votes of electors who took part in the ballot.

Aleksandr Vladimirovich Rutskoy, chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Comittee for the Affairs of Invalids, War and Labor Veterans, and the Social Protection of Servicemen and Members of Their Families, is deemed elected as RSFSR vice president.

Electoral Commission Comments

LD1906142591 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1307 GMT 19 Jun 91

[Excerpt] A report from Mayak: The session of the Central Electoral Commission on the elections of the president of the Russian Federation has just finished. Our special correspondent Vladimir Korablev is on the phone with the details.

[Korablev] At today's final session of the Central Electoral Commission on elections of the president of the Russian Federation, the results of the elections held on 12 June were summed up. Over 106 million voters were included on the electoral roll in 88 electoral constituencies set up on the territory of the republic. About 80 million voters took part in the election, or 74 percent of the total. Six candidates ran for election as president of the Russian Federation. We have already reported [?the results], or rather, the number of votes cast for each candidate has not changed, so I won't go back to that. I shall only point out that because of violations committed during the course of the elections and during vote-counting, the Central Electoral Commission has declared invalid the results of voting in polling station no. 389, Leningrad Oblast electoral constituency, and polling station no. 1904, Novosibirsk electoral constituency. This has not affected the election results, however.

In accordance with Article 15 of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] on election of the president of the Russian Federation, Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin has been elected president of the RSFSR, and Aleksandr Vladimirovich Rutskoy vice president. The appropriate protocols were signed at the final session of the Central Electoral Commission. [passage omitted]

Moscow Party Chief on 'Defeat'

LD2006125291 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0850 GMT 20 Jun 91

[Text] Moscow, 20 Jun (TASS)—In an interview published in today's edition of the newspaper 'GLASNOST,' Yuriy Prokofyev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the party's Moscow City Committee, expresses his view on the results of the 12 June elections. "If at the referendum on the fate of the Union the Communist Party achieved an unconditional victory," he stated, "then this time, it lost unconditionally, which has to be frankly acknowledged." Boris Yeltsin and Gavriil Popov appeared under the slogans of 'Democratic Russia,' and all their challengers, except Vladimir Zhirinovskiy, were CPSU representatives, albeit with different views on its policy. So, in the view of the leader of the Moscow Communists, what is involved first and foremost is not the victory or the defeat of individual personalities, but the attitude of the voters to the political forces.

Sixty-five percent of the inhabitants of Moscow, Yuriy Prokofyev continues, today express dissatisfaction at the economic and moral state of society. They feel that the situation is close to catastrophic, and they are not counting on improvement in the near future. Muscovites link their hopes with radical—precisely radical—reforms. The majority are completely indifferent as to the direction these reforms will take—toward capitalization or with the preservation of socialist bearings. It is important that there be reforms and that they should yield a positive effect or at least some movement toward improvement. This is the mood of the people. This is a truth and it is senseless to shut one's eyes. Today, Communists have been unable to propose such a radical program. It is impossible today to obtain the support of society by offering it old ideas, neither will one win if one endlessly shuffles about the same faces from the nomenklatura. It is necessary to advance leaders of promise.

Among such leaders, the leader of the Communists of the capital named bulldozer driver Konstantin Nikolayev, member of the CPSU Central Committee; teacher Leonid Belov; engineer Mikhail Yashin; and the candidate of historical sciences Sergey Chernyakhovskiy. Potentially, these are the people, Yuriy Prokofyev feels, who in two to three years could come to the fore.

"In any event, we have no intention of departing into obscure opposition," the first secretary of the Moscow City Committee of the CPSU stressed. "I had a conversation with Gavriil Popov and we agreed that Communists will take part in the structures of the city authority which are being created. Don't forget that Deputy Mayor Yuriy Luzhkov is a member of the CPSU".

Yeltsin on Presidential Tasks

LD1906151691 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1200 GMT 19 Jun 91

[Text] Good day, dear listeners. This is Sergey Belyayev in the studio. The news service offers you a review of the Russian press.

I will begin it with a Boris Yeltsin interview published by the newspaper ROSSIYA. In it, Boris Nikolayevich defined his main task as Russian president, which is to stop a deepening of the crisis, to get started on stabilizing the situation in Russia and improving it on the basis of radical reforms, and to bring stable and dynamic development to Russia more quickly. In the view of the first Russian president, this will require two to three years. Replying to a question about how relations with the center are to be built in the future, Yeltsin noted that only three main areas are being delegated to the Union: the Ministry of Defense; the Ministry of Railways; and the Ministry of Power Engineering. We are rejecting the remaining 60 or so Union ministries, the Russian leader stressed. We are not going to set up similar structures but, rather, will grant rights to enterprises and give them economic independence.

What kind of Russia do you wish to build, socialist or capitalist? Yeltsin has recently been asked this question more than once. This is how he replied to it in the pages of ROSSIYA: neither capitalist nor socialist. We are embarking on work for reviving Russia for the sake of its citizens, for the sake of improving their lives. That is the most important task. As to what this system will be called, sociologists will think that up, said Boris Yeltsin.

As we know, Boris Nikolayevich is presently on a working visit in the United States of America. But prior to setting off, he gave an interview to MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI. A conversation between Boris Yeltsin and the paper's chief edior Yegor Yakovlev is published in today's issue. Recently the foreign visits of our officials have been accompanied by requests for help. As the popular saying goes: They go with hat in hand. With what is Yeltsin going to the United States? That was one of the questions. We will not beg. That is our fundamental position. I have no intention of begging either in the United States or anywhere else. Probably, Russia will not be refused finances now, since people can see that we are not changing course with regard to the reforms and democratization of society. But is it really a case of obtaining credits? We need something other than this, namely the kind of laws that will open up opportunities for foreign investors to come to us, to come to us themselves. Then we will not have to drag them into our immense market. We do not need debts. We need investment, the Russian leader stressed.

This is the second time he has been to the United States, though this time in quite a different capacity. In American public opinion, however, he probably remains much the same, namely Gorbachev's long-standing opponent. This is what Yeltsin said about how far this image corresponds to reality. After signing the well-known Nine plus One statement, balanced relations formed, or rather are being formed, between Gorbachev and myself: first businesslike, second constant, and finally, based on respect for Russian sovereignty. Unless the president again changes his stance, our relations will remain unchanged. I will tell the Americans this, noted Boris Yeltsin in his interview for MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI.

Support for Zhironovskiy 'Alarming'

LD1906221691 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1635 GMT 19 Jun 91

[By TASS correspondent Lyudmila Aleksandrova]

[Text] Moscow, 19 Jun (TASS)—The final figures of the results of the elections for the first president of Russia, which were held on 12 June throughout the territory of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR], were announced today. Boris Yeltsin was victorious. He received 57.3 percent of the votes.

The main outcome of the elections is the confirmation of the considerable influence in Russia of a political force—the "Democratic Russia" movement—which emerged just a year ago and which comes out as a proponent of radical economic reforms in the economy and politics and is a political opponent of the CPSU. This movement gave political support to Boris Yeltsin.

Another outcome of the elections is the unsuccessful performance of the Russian Communist Party, which politically and organizationally supported the candidature of former Union Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov, who won 16.8 percent of the vote.

Of course, the cases of Boris Yeltsin and Nikolay Ryzhkov cannot be seen purely as testimony to the influence of the political forces which supported them: a considerable role in the outcome of the ballot was also played by the attitude to them individually as politicians who are well-known in the country.

The elections demonstrated that the Russian electorate was unanimous in its rejection both of the calls to "order" by the conservative General Albert Makashov (3.7 percent), and the "policy of common sense" of Vadim Bakatin, member of the USSR Security Council (3.4 percent).

Of course, they, like Aman Tuleyev, chairman of the Kemerovo (Siberia) Oblast Soviet, who obtained 6.8 percent of the votes, were less well-known in Russia than the candidates who occupied the first two places. However, the case of the sixth contender—Vladimir Zhirinovskiy—proves that being well-known was not a decisive factor in the electorate's support of the candidates.

Some 7.8 percent of the electorate, that is, over 6 million people, voted for the 45-year old leader of the recently created and virtually unknown Liberal-Democratic party [LDP]. The phenomenon of Vladimir Zhirinovskiy's popularity was one of the most surprising results of the presidential elections. The press did not popularize him, and he was first seen on Russia's television screens at the end of April when he spoke at the Fourth Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies. The LDP leader's speech was distinguished for its unrestrained self-publicity and populism of the cheapest type, and at times even scandalous political illiteracy. One journalist wrote on the eve of the elections that the percentage of votes gained by Vladimir Zhirinovskiy will show us "just how troubled our society is." If this is so, then the symptoms are alarming enough. At all events, it is clear that many of those who voted for him did so not because they believed in the LDP leader's promise to solve all their problems at one go but because they were expressing their unacceptance of the "traditional" politicians from the two camps into which society has been split.

Zhirinovskiy Views Election

AU1906083391 Prague LIDOVE NOVINY in Czech 17 Jun 91 pp 1,3

[Interview with USSR Liberal Democratic Party Chairman Vladimir Zhirinovskiy, who came in third in the Russian presidential elections, by Jaromir Stetina; in Moscow, date not given: "We Love You, Brothers"]

[Text] [Stetina] What do the election results mean to you?

[Zhirinovskiy] A magnificent and stupendous success. The country did not know me at all. In 20 days I overtook half the candidates and came in third. The entire Russian parliament was working for Yeltsin and the entire party apparatus was working for Ryzhkov. If I had had more time, I would also have overtaken them and won.

[Stetina] Where did this success come from?

[Zhirinovskiy] I said boldly and frankly who they are: neo-Bolshevists. Secondly, I had a clear slogan: "I Will Defend Russians." Third, I submitted a concept for our domestic and foreign policy. People like it when someone has a concept.

[Stetina] You regard yourself as a liberal. Do you also regard yourself as a right-wing politician? After all, your economic program is right-wing....

[Zhirinovskiy] Yes. If I go by European standards, my program is to the right of center.

[Stetina] Would you call your program capitalist?

[Zhirinovskiy] I do not frighten people by using this word. We want a normal European society. Everything will be represented in our economy: The state sector, private ownership, cooperatives. Everyone in society will have the same opportunities. We are offering everyone the chance to become rich.

[Stetina] What about your foreign policy principles?

[Zhirinovskiy] It is necessary to sharply alter our relationship with the West, America, and Japan. We have the following concept: A transition from East-West relations to North-South relations. We want to reach an agreement with the West. We emphasize our relationship with Turkey, Iran, and Afghanistan. I say to the West: Come, let us divide up the spheres of influence. Europe toward [smerem k] Africa, the United States toward [smerem k] Latin America, and India and South East Asia for Japan and China.

[Stetina] What is your view of the Soviet troop withdrawal from Czechoslovakia?

[Zhirinovskiy] You are in too much of a hurry. You are making a mistake. You are making the army angry. It was necessary to wait until the army had built barracks and exercise areas. There should not be any troops in Czechoslovakia—neither Soviet nor German ones. We want normal relations. We love you, Slav brothers. Do you know why General Makashov became a candidate for the presidency? He is the commander of the largest military district in the country. They sent him thousands of tanks and huge numbers of people with families. Where are they supposed to live? Understand one thing: If there is a military coup in this country, it will be bad for you. The army will return by force of its weapons. Therefore, you should act more flexibly. For example, I would be a flexible president....

[Stetina] No. You would be a hard president....

[Zhirinovskiy] It depends on toward whom. Toward the South, yes; I want good relations with the West. Do you have a lot of beer in Czechoslovakia? Why do you not ship some of it here? Come, let us do business.

[Stetina] Will you campaign for the USSR presidency?

[Zhirinovskiy] By all means.

RSFSR Supreme Soviet Proceedings 19 Jun

LD1906210791

[Editorial Report] Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian at 1850 GMT on 19 June, in its scheduled "At the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Supreme Soviet" program, begins carrying recorded highlights of the proceedings at the RSFSR Supreme Soviet in the Kremlin in Moscow on 19 June.

Isakov chairs the Soviet of the Republic session. He begins by outlining the agenda for the week. For the next three days they are to work in separate chambers. Tomorrow, the battle against crime is to be examined. On today's agenda is the draft law on payment for land.

V.S. Zakharov, chairman of the committee for the social protection of the countryside, presents this draft law. he states that all land is to be paid for, regardless of the use to which it is being put. Failure to pay for land has led to the underutilization of agricultural land. The aim of the draft law is also to increase the fertility of the land under cultivation. Fixed payments are to be made to those farming poorer land, he explains.

Zakharov says that there are seven sections to the draft law. He goes on to explain in detail certain articles from these sections. For example, he explains how the normative cost of land is to be determined by the RSFSR Council of Ministers. The committee working on the draft law allows each oblast, rayon, or autonomous republic to set its own prices for land on the basis of the normative prices set by the Council of Ministers.

Zakharov then outlines some of the amendments proposed by various deputies.

At 1908 GMT the presenter states that after replying to deputies questions, the debate continued.

An unnamed deputy states that money spent on the development of agriculture is money well spent as in the future, it will mean that the RSFSR will not have to buy agricultural produce abroad. He urged that this law be adopted as soon as possible as it is urgently needed by those working on the land.

Deputy Lazarev expresses reservations about the law, charging the same amount of money for land which can vary greatly in quality even on the same collective form. He warns that the law offers no help to individuals, only to collective and state farms.

An unidentified deputy who worked on this law in the agricultural committee refutes criticism of the draft law. He explains that the tax is to take into account the quality of the land and its situation. He urges the adoption of law.

Another unidentified deputy warns against the adoption of this law. He points out that all the economic free zones will not pay any tax at all. There are already several exemptions and he warns that these exemptions will increase, and eventually the amount received from the tax will be considerably less than the figure quoted in the draft law.

At 1923 GMT Isakov announces that the law is to be voted upon. It is not passed, not reaching the required level by one per cent. Isakov concludes that the law can be submitted for its first reading at the next congress.

At 1924 GMT the presenter states that in the afternoon, the draft law on medical insurance was passed in its first reading.

At 1925 GMT There is an interview with an unidentified deputy about the proceedings at the Soviet of Nationalities today. On the agenda today was the draft law on languages and the draft law on the rehabilitation of political prisoners from 1917 to the present day. The law does not envisage rehabilitating those who committed acts of violence, even if these acts were carried out for political motives, he explains. This was the afternoon session. The deputy continues saying that Nosovets opened the morning session by proposing a vote of no-confidence in Abdulatipov.

At 1930 GMT there is an interview with S.A. Nosovets who explains why he called for the vote of no-confidence. He says he collected signatures for this vote of no-confidence. He warns that the chairman is not in agreement with the majority of deputies in the RSFSR Soviet of Nationalities. Other unidentified deputies are then shown criticising Abdulatipov.

At 1933 GMT the interview with the initial deputy resumes. He concludes that next Wednesday there is to be a vote of no-confidence in Abdulatipov.

The final issue examined is the draft law on languages. The basis of the law is that the Russian language should be preserved in the federation while allowing other languages to be used. A deputy expresses reservations about some of the wording used in the draft law.

Debate on Bills Detailed

LD1906185291 Moscow TASS in English 1813 GMT 19 Jun 91

[By TASS parliamentary correspondents Yuriy Kozmin and Andrey Surzhanskiy]

[Text] Moscow June 19 TASS—The Russian Federation parliament, which resumed its work today after a three-week break, considered at its chambers the bill "On Payment for Land". The bill provides for introducing payment for the use of and on the territory of the Russian Federation.

According to bill authors, the current system of free ownership of land is the main cause of it being used ineffectively. According to their estimates, the overall sum of annual payment for land, due to be paid into the budgets of local governing councils, will top 36 billion rubles.

After the discussion, during which the deputies expressed much criticism of the bill, the document was sent for revision by the two chambers.

On Wednesday the parliamentarians also discussed the bill "On Languages of the Russian Federation Peoples". The bill marks the first time that such a document has been worked out in Russia, the republic with the largest number of nationalities. According to the bill authors, it will provide equal conditions for the development and preservation of languages of all peoples of the Russian federation.

Having approved the bill in general, members of the Supreme Soviet criticised provisions relating to the delimitation of the status of languages: official, state, etc. Some speakers said that Russian cannot be announced a state language only on the territory of krays and regions of the Russian Federation, while leaving this issue to be decided by local authorities in autonomies. Many speakers voiced apprehensions that such a decision of the Supreme Soviet can cause inter-ethnic strife. After revision, the bill will be submitted for consideration by the Russian parliament.

At the session of the Chamber of Nationalities some deputies moved to hold a no-confidence vote in the chamber chairman, Ramazan Abdulatipov, who signed a political statement this February which negatively assessed the activity of Boris Yeltsin as Russian parliament head. It was decided to hear Abdulatipov's report in a week's time. A similar proposal regarding Chairman of the Chamber of the Republics Boris Isakov, who also signed the statement, was not supported by deputies.

No-Confidence in Abdulatipov Cited

LD1906144291

[Editorial Report] Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian at 1100 GMT on 19 June carries a four minute live report by an unidentified correspondent from the joint session of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet in Moscow.

The correspondent reports the Soviet of the Republic is discussing the draft law on payment for land. Both chambers are discussing the same bill in separate sittings today, he says. The correspondent says: "While the Soviet of the Republic was discussing the question of the draft law on payment for land, there was a supries in the Soviet of Nationalities. Confidence in the chairman of the chamber, Ramazan Abdulatipov, was questioned. There was a strident discussion. Much criticism was directed at the present chairman of the chamber, and after a vote, the question of confidence in him was included in the agenda of the session, and will be examined on Wednesday, 26 June, at the chamber session. Abdulatipov will have to deliver an account of the work done over the year. Deputy Sergey Nosovets was the one who proposed including this matter on the agenda."

The correspondent then asks Nosovets about the proposal. Nosovets says he raised the matter on behalf of at least 45 members of the Chamber of Nationalities, who protested following the statement of the group of six questioning Yeltsin's leadership. The whole issue, he says, will be discussed on 26 June," because today there was an evident breach of the situation, so to speak. Supporters of Abdulatipov, that is, and Abdulatipov himself, were saying that the democratic majority in the Soviet of Nationalities, that is, the majority today, happily, is suppressing heterodox thinking, that is on the part of Abdulatipov."

Nosovets says this is not the case, because they regard Abdulatipov as being guilty not of dissident thinking, but of dissident action.

Nosovets says: "As chairman of the chamber, he acts in contravention of, or directly contrary to, the policy of the Russian Supreme Soviet, the Congress of People's Deputies, the chairman, and currently president of Russia, Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin."

Nosovets lists named votes in the chamber showing that Abdulatipov "has no moral right to occupy the post of chairman of the chamber," and "at the last elections, which fortunately for us turned out very successfully, Abdulatipov opted for direct opposition to the reforms which we, with the help of President Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin, are trying to implement."

Nosovets points out that most voters in Abdulatipov's constituency favored Yeltsin.

Moscow City Council Begins Vote for New Chair

LD1806180491 Moscow TASS in English 1738 GMT 18 Jun 91

[By TASS correspondent Roman Grigoryev]

[Text] Moscow June 18 TASS—Moscow City Council on Tuesday began elections of a new chairman from among ten candidates nominated for this post, which had been held by Gavriil Popov during the past year.

After First Deputy Chairman of the City Council Boris Stankevich withdrew his candidature, observers say deputy chairman of the council, economist Nikolay Gonchar, is likely to win.

Moscow Mayor Popov and Vice-Mayor Yuriy Luzhkov, elected on June 12, began their activity with allowing Moscow's pensioners free-of-charge travel by bus, trolley-bus, tram and metro in Moscow from July 1. They also plan to restore order at Moscow's markets plagued with corruption and high prices.

Within two weeks, control over all markets will be transferred to district councils, which will hire markets' directors on a contract basis and regularly change markets' inspectors.

Privatisation of trade enterprises is under way in Moscow.

The new chairman of the city council is expected to be named late on Tuesday or on Wednesday.

Gonchar Wins Election

LD2006083891 Moscow TASS in English 0822 GMT 20 Jun 91

[Text] Moscow June 20 TASS—Nikolay Gonchar was elected new chairman of the Moscow City Council (Mossoviet). The voting results were announced at a Mossoviet session today. Gonchar will replace Gavriil Popov, who was elected mayor by a direct secret ballot.

Gonchar was deputy chairman of Mossoviet and chairman of the Bauman regional council.

Leningrad Mayor Anatoliy Sobchak Interviewed

PM1906110591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 19 Jun 91 Union Edition p 7

[Interview with Anatoliy Sobchak, mayor of Leningrad, by journalist Ye. Domnysheva; date and place of interview not stated; first paragraph is introduction: "Anatoliy Sobchak: There Was No Fear on the Summits"]

[Text] The Leningraders recently elected their first mayor. He is Anatoliy Sobchak. Immediately after the election journalist Ye. Domnysheva spoke with him.

[Domnysheva] Anatoliy Aleksandrovich! One does not even know whether to congratulate you on your victory at the election or to express sympathy over the responsibility which you have assumed. I say this because you did not even take part in your own election campaign. Against the background of the hard rounds of the struggle in Moscow that looked rather strange.

[Sobchak] Yes, I rejected the election struggle. All the money allocated to me for the purpose, and it was about 75,000 rubles, I handed over to equip a children's home. There were no posters, leaflets, or appeals published. Leningraders know me, they are familiar with my plans and with my program of work and I did not consider it necessary to spend time and money on agitation. After my nomination I spoke on this subject just once, saying that if I was elected I would be profoundly grateful for the trust and if I was not elected I would be even more grateful for a free life. I decided that if the people agree with what I am doing and suggesting, if they trust me, and if the Leningraders need me, then at the election they would either support my program or not. It is a very great pity that there were only two of us at the finish.

[Domnysheva] Your rival was Yuriy Sevenard, the chief of construction of the Leningrad dam, a very strange nomination in view of the fact that the project itself, not to mention its construction, is extremely unpopular in Leningrad.

[Sobchak] Sevenard was nominated by the CPSU Obkom [oblast committee]. I shall not venture to judge why it was him but in recent years this is the Communists' first nomination. Party circles obviously had some ideas of their own on this score.

[Domnysheva] Would they not be like rejoinders which were frequently heard: Let Sobchak get all the power, it is still only nominal, and then we shall make him answerable when the center blocks his appointment.

[Sobchak] I do not think that is exactly how matters stand. Although I do not rule out such calculations. But the election was a general one. It was the people who showed trust in me and it is to them that I am answerable, not to the Leningrad Soviet deputies or the CPSU obkom. It is for Leningraders that I intend to implement a program of economic and managerial transformations.

[Domnysheva] Your victory at the election was more than convincing—72 percent. But they say that in each victory there is always a drop of defeat—it is the beginning of a new start, of new difficulties. Very many democrats both in our country and abroad in Eastern Europe now admit that the path to victory was far easier than the burden of power which now rests on their shoulders. And many are not holding out, they are leaving.

[Sobchak] I understand these people very well and I do not condemn them. I am a mountaineer. Now, unfortunately, an ex-mountaineer. And we have the concept of a height limit. Far from everyone can climb the highest peaks. Some are afraid, others have different, very unpleasant feelings which prevent them from scaling great heights. So, each person, like each mountaineer, has his limit. It is important to choose a mountain which you can scale in life, in work, in your degree of responsibility.

[Domnysheva] Have you reached your height limit?

[Sobchak] Not in mountaineering. I was not afraid on a single summit.

[Domnysheva] And in life? When you agreed last year to work in the Leningrad Soviet, your action surprised many people. And one American senator actually said to you, if you remember: "In our country such a step would be assessed as concession and defeat!"

[Sobchak] From the viewpoint of an American the senator was absolutely right. But the United States is a country with a stable, harmonious system of mutual relations, management, concepts, and much else. In our country everything is different today. At that time I simply could not stand aloof.

[Domnysheva] But you were not to one side....

[Sobchak] The point is that having worked in the USSR Supreme soviet for more than a year I realized what kind of a structure it is, what it is capable of. I had more than enough disappointments. I had many ideas, but it was extremely difficult to implement them. That is why I decided (not without lengthy reflection) that I should agree to the Leningrad deputies' proposal in the hope of moving at least something.

[Domnysheva] But this is so much out of character. You are a professor, an intellectual, a man of science... engaging in what would seem to be not your business at all. Surely you cannot gain pleasure from the fact that you have to clear out what are essentially the "Augean stables" left behind by previous rulers.

[Sobchak] Undoubtedly a normal person can hardly gain pleasure from that. But forgive me, sitting in filth in your own home is the limit. To avoid living in disgusting conditions you have to clean. Yes, yes, a professor also has to clean. But today I want to ensure that the obstructions are cleared away not by rusty spades and old rags but to a modern standard, as is done throughout the civilized world.

[Domnysheva] Is the free zone the first step?

[Sobchak] It is rather a dash forward on a track on which many steps have already been made.

[Domnysheva] Very many people are confused by the word "zone." Knowing how great is our potential for social envy, is it not terrible to create a paradise in an individual "city-zone?" After all, people are expiring and will not allow you to set yourselves up better than other people.

[Sobchak] There is enough of that in our country, but there is also an increase in the number of people who understand that there is always something to be taken from a rich man, but there is nothing to take from a pauper. The richer Leningrad is, the more it will do for Russia.

[Domnysheva] Nonetheless.... So many conflicts, so much nervous stain over the year.... Do you not regret it?

[Sobchak] Everything has happened, but I knew one thing firmly: I do not have the right to betray that for whose sake I began. I can only go forward. And to the end.... People have put their trust in me and I must withstand everything. I was most annoyed by the factional struggle in the Leningrad Soviet and the deputy corps' inability to engage in productive work. But what can you do, you cannot change everything at once.

[Domnysheva] Now you are chairman of the Leningrad Soviet and your "great confrontation" with some of the deputies is obviously switching to a new phase of development. According to your scenario, how will relations between the mayor and the Leningrad Soviet develop?

[Sobchak] I fear that I will not be able to draw for you a picture of idyllic love. There are a great many problems in our city home, everyone admits that and knows it, which means there will be disputes. But I very much hope that the interests of the city and the Leningraders will be the basis for our mutual relations. And also reason, balance, and mutual understanding.

[Domnysheva] In our country some people fear dictatorship while others are virtually demanding a "strong hand." How could the dictatorial ways of the first mayor, Anatoliy Sobchak, be expressed?

[Sobchak] They will simply not exist.

[Domnysheva] How did the first day after the election victory pass?

[Sobchak] As an ordinary day for the chairman of the Leningrad Soviet. The rest is ahead.

Joint Patrolling Ruling Reported

PM1906133391 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 19 Jun 91 Union Edition p 1

[INTERFAX report: "Joint Patrolling on Leningrad Streets"]

[Text] There has been an announcement in Leningrad on a ruling by the city's elected mayor, Anatoliy Sobchak, on the introduction of joint army-militia patrolling in the city as of 15 July.

In an interview with an INTERFAX correspondent Yuriy Vdovin, a member of the Leningrad Soviet Presidium, reported that A. Sobchak has signed this ruling without any agreements with the Leningrad Soviet deputy structures. Yu. Vdovin stressed that the position of the Leningrad Soviet, which has rejected the idea of joint patrolling in the city on several occasions, remains the same.

Silayev Heads Discussion on Economic Program

LD1906175491 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1631 GMT 19 Jun 91

[By TASS correspondent Lyudmila Aleksandrova]

[Text] Moscow, 19 June (TASS)— Practical measures for implementing the Russian Government's program for stabilizing the economy and switching to the market were discussed at a conference of eminent economists and members of the republican cabinet which took place at the village of "Sosenki" near Moscow today. The conference was chaired by Ivan Silayev, head of the Russian Government.

The main issue discussed today was the ways and methods of privatization. The majority of participants in the conference believe that the initial stage of privatization should be extended for at least a year and that it should be implemented gradually. At the same time a number of radical economists of market orientation are coming out in favor of implementing it "at a stroke, simultaneously, in an accelerated regime."

Participants in the meeting confirmed: Privatization must be carried out, mainly, on a payment-free basis, when all citizens receive payment cheques and use them for buying out state property.

In Ivan Silayev's words, a more detailed economic program will have been prepared by the time the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] president is approved in his post and a candidate for prime minister is nominated. Having remarked that he would like to stay head of the RSFSR Government, Ivan Silayev pointed to the need for changes both in the personnel and the structure of the government.

A program for joint action by the USSR Cabinet of Ministers and the governments of Union republics, according to the head of the government, has been developed and is nearing completion. The Russian Government has not signed it for the time being since there remain several acute issues there: on distributing competence between the republics and the center regarding the banking system, currency, and the taxation system—double or single-channelled. Ivan Silayev told the TASS correspondent that he does not see any "drama or a situation of impasse." Already this year Russia has been using the single-channel system of republican taxation. "We remain convinced that precisely such a system is needed. We will pay the center fixed contributions for specific programs," he said. In connection with this, it looks most likely that the joint program will simply contain Russia's special opinion, something which will not hinder the signing of the document.

"By no means should one formulate the issue in such a way as to imply that the Russian program is in opposition to the Union one, Aleksandr Granberg, director of the Institute for Economics and Organization of Industrial Production, told the TASS correspondent. "Almost a year ago Russia started organizing horizontal economic relations with republics, but we never denied the need for republic-centre vertical mutual links, either." The main thing is not to slacken the pace of economic reforms now, "at the crossing," he believes.

Tatar President Ready To Cooperate With Russia

LD1806160791 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1500 GMT 18 Jun 91

[Text] The irreconcilable position of Tataria cannot endanger the signing of the new Union treaty, Mintimer Shaymiyev, president of Tataria, said in an interview with an RIA correspondent—the Russian Information Agency—prior to the beginning of the latest meeting of the preparation committee members in Novo Ogarevo. He thinks that the desire of the republic to sign the Union treaty independently, granting it extensive powers, including a full quota in central representation bodies of power, will not affect the relations with Russia which have established in the course of history.

According to Shaymiyev, the Russian Federation should be renewed. Tatarstan is in favor of concluding a treaty with it based on equal rights. We are not heading for confrontation, stressed the leader of Tataria. Our policy enjoys the support of people in the republic, and elections results have proved that it is the right policy.

Makhachkala Muslims Regret Troubles Over Hajj

LD1806093791 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 17 Jun 91

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] As we have already reported, a state of emergency was introduced in the capital of Dagestan, Makhachkala on 13 June. This took place after disorder on the city's main square and also after an attack by those taking part in the disorder at the republican Council of Ministers building. They demanded a reduction of the cost of the hajj—the pilgrimage to Mecca—for more than 10,000 people. The situation in Makhachkala today—here is a report by our correspondent.

[D. Beybutov] How is Makhachkala living today under the special regime which has been introduced here for the first time? It is having no effect at all on the customary rhythm of the city. People are at work and going about their daily business. However there is an unpleasant aftertaste.

Whoever one speaks with this these days, including believers, led by the leadership of the spiritual administration of the Muslims of Dagestan, there is unanimity in the appraisal of the actions of some of the extremist individuals who provoked the excesses at the meeting.

[Begin Mufti Bagautdin Khadzhi Isayev recording] We very much regret that this happened. I think that it was possible for this not to have happened since we had plans. An agreement was concluded with Aeroflot for eight flights. We planned to send 1,200, and in addition, everything had been prepared for vehicle transport. But, as a result, everything has been disrupted. They came. Well, we were able to send about 900 people. We very very much regret what happened. This does not become our Muslims. [video shows foot patrols of soldiers in vicinity of official building, roadblocks, line of troops beside APCs, cars being searched, and interview wth Mufti Isayev] [end recording]

Russian Internal Troops Exercise Begins in Omsk

LD2006123791 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1000 GMT 20 Jun 91

[Text] Major command staff exercises of troops of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Ministry of Internal Affairs, code-named Shturm [assault/storm] began in Omsk today. Public safety representatives of regional and transportation internal affairs' administrations of the Asiatic session of Russia and a number of oblasts in the republic's European north are working through methods of managing personnel in circumstances that are extraordinary, but that have already become not uncommon: in repulsing attacks on city and rayon departments of internal affairs; escapes from special establishments of the Ministry of Internal Affairs; and detaining runaways and particularly dangerous criminals. At a proving ground outside the town, special purpose companies will demonstrate ways to fight terrorists and plane hijacking, how to free hostages, and readiness for mobile transfers and combat actions.

Western Republics

Belorussian Parliament Rejects Strikers' Demands

LD1906084991 Moscow TASS in English 2203 GMT 18 Jun 91

[Text] Minsk June 19 TASS—The Belorussian parliament on Tuesday rejected demands by the republic's striking committees to dissolve party committees at industrial enterprises and organisations, depoliticise law enforcement bodies and nationalise the property of the Soviet and Belorussian Communist Parties.

The parliament called them "inconsistent with the Belorussian Constitution, international and Soviet laws".

The republic's public prosecution office and its bodies have been instructed to "ensure control over the implementation of laws on political parties and other public organisations by state enterprises, organisations and citizens, as well as political parties and public organisations. Violators will be called to account".

The parliament issued a separate resolution to reject demands for nationalising the property of the Soviet and Belorussian Communist Parties as "counteracting the Belorussian Constitution and laws".

First secretary of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee Anatoliy Malofeyev told the parliament that the Soviet and Belorussian Communist Parties' property, formed by many generations of Communists, is estimated at 101 million roubles.

Subsidies to the republic's Communist Party from the CPSU Central Committee totalled 143 million roubles over the past 50 years. The property is part of the whole party's property and this fact cannot be ignored, Malofeyev said.

'Belorussian Communists for Democracy' Formed

LD1806192991 Vilnius Radio Vilnius Network in Belorussian 1915 GMT 16 Jun 91

[Text] The other day at the session of the Belorussian Supreme Soviet, the state of emergency law in the republic was killed. As is known, Comrade Malofeyev, present secretary of the Communist Party of Belorussia, already voiced his proposal on introducing a state of emergency in the USSR at the plenum of the CPSU. But he was not supported. Now he has undergone a fiasco in his own patrimony, in Belorussia.

It is also interesting that simultaneously with the last deviation to the left of President-General Secretary Gorbachev, the Belorussian Communists are becoming obviously more left. Thus, from among the Communist deputies of the Supreme Soviet of the Belorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, a deputies group "Belorussian Communists for Democracy" has been created. People's Deputy Lukashenko is the head of these new champions of democracy. At present the group consists of 30 people.

Belorussian Group Opposes Changing USSR's Name

PM1906133991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Jun 91 Second Edition p 2

[Unattributed report: "And What About the Referendum?"]

[Text] The Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau has adopted a resolution which expounds its position on the question of the name of the future Union federation. A decision to preserve the present name of the USSR—the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics—was adopted at the Fourth Congress of People's Deputies, the resolution says. According to a congress decision, the question was also submitted to a national ballot (referendum). The results of the referendum are well known: A total of 76.4 percent, or the overwhelming majority of the country's population that took part in the referendum, expressed their support for the integrity and future development of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. The over 5 million citizens of the Belorussian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] also expressed their resolute will: A total of 82.7 percent of those who took part in the referendum voted in support of the preservation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

In this connection, the resolution notes, the position of the preparatory committee for concluding work on the draft new Union treaty, which proposed its name for the future federation—the Union of Soviet Sovereign Republics, leaving out the word "Socialist"—is perplexing. Thus the decision of the USSR Congress of People's Deputies, as the supreme organ of the country's state power, and the results of the national referendum—and therefore the will of the Soviet people—are being ignored.

The Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau proposes that M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR president, take all the necessary measures so that in accordance with the will of the people of our multiethnic fatherland, its name—the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics—in which all the merits of the historic past come together and the future sociopolitical system of our state is determined, be preserved. According to the Central Committee Bureau, it is necessary to make more active efforts in support of the will expressed at the USSR referendum by the Soviet people, who support a renewed union federation under the name of Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and to resolutely repulse attempts by individual political groupings and their leaders to change the political course of our state's development.

Reportage on Ukraine Supreme Soviet Session

Near Split Over Appointments Noted

LD1906211391 Moscow TASS in English 2105 GMT 19 Jun 91

[By UKRINFORM correspondents Viktor Demidenko and Aleksandr Litvinov]

[Text] Kiev June 19 TASS—The Ukrainian parliament on Wednesday found itself on the verge of a split over the ministerial nominations proposed by Prime Minister Vitold Fokin.

The nominations included Nikolay Zhulinski, a prominent scholar and deputy head of the institute of literature of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences as minister for humanitarian policies, writer Yuriy Scherbak, who is also a Soviet people's deputy known for his truthful books about the Chernobyl disaster and chairman of the republican Green Party, as environment minister, and Kiev Polytechnical Institute rector Petr Talanchuk as minister of higher education.

Other contenders included Viktor Salnikov, former head of a major building trust and then first deputy chairman of the Kiev City Council, who was nominated for the post of the denationalization and demonopolization minister, and Viktor Kravchenko, a foreign trade specialist, for minister of foreign economic relations.

A heated debate began after Yuriy Scherbak and Viktor Salnikov were endorsed in their new posts. Neither Zhulinski nor Talanchuk won the backing of a majority. After a vote on Zhulinski's nomination some parliamentarians walked out in protest. Kravchenko was approved as foreign economic minister by a majority.

The deputies also approved the concept of a new constitution and instructed the constitutional commission to work out the constitution of the Ukraine on its basis.

The session continues to work.

Economic Laws Approved

LD1906104591 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1530 GMT 18 Jun 91

[Text] The session of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet resumed today after the holidays. Two important economic laws were passed: one on investment activity, on the first reading; and one on securities and the stock exchange, on the second reading. The law on all-Ukrainian and local referendums was also passed. It was decided to mark 16 July each year as Ukrainian Independence Day. This day will be a holiday, and the celebration of Constitution Day has been abolished.

Ukraine's Khmara Calls Trial 'Farce'

OW2006012591 Moscow INTERFAX in English 0930 GMT 19 Jun 91

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] "I refuse to take part in this farce", said Ukrainian People's Deputy Stepan Khmara following Tuesday's legal proceedings against him and six other defendants involved in the incident of November 7, 1990.

S. Khmara is charged with having used violence against Police Colonel Grigoryev on the day of October Revolution festivities in Kiev.

At the trial, which began on Monday, the lawyers demanded that one of the defendants, Oleg Batovkin, be released from police custody, and that another defendant, Aleksandr Kovalchuk, be subjected to one more medical examination. The lawyers' request to free Batovkin whose offense does not merit imprisonment was turned down. As for Kovalchuk, the court decided that his mental state should be examined once again. The trial was postponed till the examination is concluded.

"This trial is a sham," Stepan Khmara told IF's [INTERFAX] correspondent. "The verdict had been pronounced before the trial began. It provides for putting the defendants in jail. This means that the method of punishment was decided in advance, and all that is taking place at the trial is a shameful farce. So, I refuse to take part in this farce in protest against political banditry."

Ukrainian War Commemoration Day Announced

PM1806100791 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Jun 91 Union Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Commemoration Day in Ukraine"]

[Text] The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet has adopted a resolution on the proclamation of 22 June as a day of nationwide commemoration of the victims of the war, TASS reports.

The same document defines the package of measures to mark the 50th anniversary of the start of the Great Patriotic War and the organization of the partisan and underground movement in the Ukraine. It is also planned to hold a republican "Fraternity" peace march and to take additional steps to improve housing and material and daily living conditions and medical services for war veterans, invalids, and widows.

Deeds Exchanged Ratifying Ukrainian-Kyrgyz Treaty

LD1706082591 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1442 GMT 17 Jun 91

[Text] Kiev, 17 Jun (TASS)—Leonid Kravchuk, chairman of the Ukraine Supreme Soviet, and Askar Akayev, president of the Republic of Kyrgyzstan, today exchanged deeds here on the ratification by the two republics' highest legislative bodies of the treaty of friendship and cooperation between the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Republic of Kyrgyzstan, UKRINFORM AGENCY correspondent Anatoliy Grigoryev reports. This document was signed by the two leaders on 2 April 1991 in Bishkek.

During the exchange ceremony Leonid Kravchuk and Askar Akayev highly appraised the treaty, which envisages mutually beneficial cooperation between the two sovereign states in politics, economics, health, ecology, science, technology, trade, and in humanitarian and other spheres.

It was stressed that the establishment of such mutually beneficial bilateral ties is now the most secure form of keeping the economic situation under control and of preserving the Union's economic integrity.

Moldovan Leaders Congratulate Yeltsin on Election

LD1806191691 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1422 GMT 17 Jun 91

[Text] Kishinev, 17 Jun (TASS)—Without waiting for the official results of the presidential elections which took place in the Russian Federation on 12 June, Mircha Snegur, president of the Republic of Moldova; Aleksandr Moshanu, speaker of parliament; and Valeriy Muravskiy, the prime minister, have sent a greetings telegram to Boris Yeltsin, according to Anatoliy Golya and Aleksandr Tanas, correspondents for the MOLDOVA-PRES agency.

Having wished the first president in the history of Russia big successes in his post, the Moldovan leaders expressed hope for close and fruitful cooperation for the good of the peoples. They expressed confidence that the first Russian president will lead the republic along a path of democratic transformations and reforms.

Horizontal links have already been established between the two republics. In the fall of 1990 Boris Yeltsin and Mircha Snegur signed a treaty on economic cooperation. The document has not, however, been ratified yet by the parliaments of the two republics.

Caucasus

Gamsakhurdia Interviewed by Turkish Daily

AU1906111191 Tbilisi SAKARTVELOS RESPUBLIKA in Georgian 7 Jun 91 p 1

[Interview with Georgian President Zviad Gamsakhurdia by TURKIA Editor Bilal K'ochak and economic columnist Engin Senol; abridged interview prepared for publication by Zaza Daraseli; interview is headlined "Friendly Relations Will Be Established" and datelined Tbilisi, 30 May]

[Text] **Here is the interview given by Mr. Zviad Gamsakhurdia, the president of the Republic of Georgia, to Mr. Bilal K'ochak, editor of the European department of TURKIA, one of the most influential central newspapers in Turkey, and Mr. Engin Senol, the paper's economic columnist, on 30 May this year.**

[TURKIA] Mr. President, on behalf of the TURKIA editorial board, I have the honor of greeting you and congratulating you on your election as president of Georgia. Your victory in the elections by such an overwhelming majority is remarkable. You are truly a national hero. You have experienced much torture and suffering and remained fearless in the struggle for Georgian independence. You have traveled a long road and now occupy a worthy position. We have heard about this in Turkey and now we can see it for ourselves. Thank you for finding time to see us and agreeing to give us an interview. We will try not to inconvenience you too much. We would like to give equal attention in our conversation to the world political situation and to the present situation in the Soviet Union and Georgia.

Last year, as a result of the famous meeting [in Paris] at which 55 countries were represented at the highest level, the cold war was finally brought to an end and the process of political relaxation was extended. How do you assess the current situation in the world and the position of the Soviet Union?

[Gamsakhurdia] Indeed, the situation has changed. As a result of the efforts of the world's progressive states, there has been a victory for common sense. The Soviet Union has embarked upon a more realistic policy (for example, the disintegration of the East European socialist camp, the unification of Germany, and so forth) and it has stopped waging the cold war abroad. However, it has now embarked upon a cold war inside the country, waging it against those republics that are struggling for independence. Moreover, this cold war is turning into a real war in different spots in the Union as shown by the attacks carried out by Soviet troops in the republics. The regional conflicts in the Baltic republics and in the Caucasus are a clear example of direct armed intervention. Moscow is launching direct aggression against Georgia in north Georgia or in the so-called South Ossetian Oblast. The legally elected government is under constant threat. If the aim of the Brezhnev doctrine was to subordinate the East European countries through armed force while he acted as a dictator toward them, the Gorbachev doctrine is aimed at subordinating the countries within the Union through the use of force. This is the Soviet Union's political course today. The center is trying, through military force, to suppress democracy and the aspiration of enslaved nations toward freedom.

[TURKIA] Do you think, Mr. president, that all this signifies a return to the past?

[Gamsakhurdia] Yes, they want a return to totalitarianism. The fairly powerful faction "Soyuz" in the so-called Soviet parliament is struggling to achieve this. It is in favor of bloody repression and against democracy and the national-liberation movement.

[TURKIA] The country has lived under a Communist regime for 70 years. You, Mr. president, have been struggling against this regime all your life. What can you say about Communism? What is this "Communism?" In general, how do you interpret the word?

[Gamsakhurdia] As symbolizing all manner of lies and falsehoods. As regards the theory of Communism itself, this represents the greatest threat to mankind and to his future. Communism signifies the destruction of every form of democracy and national self-determination. It is an evil doctrine that is anticultural and antihuman.

Today, the Kremlin is hiding behind the mask of democratic slogans such as perestroyka and glasnost, but things are proceeding as before.

[TURKIA] During the last six years, journalists around the world have been writing about Gorbachev, "perestroyka," and "glasnost." Do you think that this is nevertheless a mask? Furthermore, in the same Soviet parliament, Russian democrats are saying that Communism is a mask for Russian chauvinism. What can you say about this?

[Gamsakhurdia] It's absolutely true. Of course it's a mask because Communist ideas and totalitarianism have been finally disgraced throughout the world. This is why the Soviet system has invented these new concepts "perestroyka" and "glasnost" that do not bring any benefit to the conquered nations. In this way, the Kremlin is continuing its chauvinistic and expansionist policy. Therefore, it is true that all this is a mask for Russian chauvinism.

Today, troops are being brought here from Germany and Czechoslovakia. [Moscow] claims that there is no other place for them and that, therefore, it has no other alternative. They have lost East Europe and, now, these nations [the republics] have to be kept in enslavement. This is how the Gorbachev doctrine is actually being implemented.

[TURKIA] Can you compare Gorbachev with Yeltsin? They say that Yeltsin is Gorbachev's follower, only far more reactionary!

[Gamsakhurdia] It's very difficult to say until the elections are over and until Yeltsin, after his victory, formulates his own political course.

Gorbachev's policy is the same old Leninist-Stalinist imperialist policy, only embellished with so-called "perestroyka" and "glasnost" and made to look more democratic by the Union treaty and so forth.

[TURKIA] The Soviet Union is the last empire in the world, an empire that is collapsing. Six republics, particularly Georgia, want to restore their independence. How do you view future developments?

[Gamsakhurdia] Everything now depends on what help these republics will be given by the world and to what extent their aspirations for legal status and independence will be recognized.

[TURKIA] Representatives of these six republics recently met in Moldova. What can you tell us about the decisions that were adopted?

[Gamsakhurdia] Yes, there was a meeting of representatives of the national movements of these six republics. It was decided that there was a need for greater consolidation, greater coordination of actions, and more mutual understanding and assistance in order to defend themselves against the aggressive policy of the colonial imperialist regime.

[TURKIA] Do these six republics intend to draw up some kind of official agreement?

[Gamsakhurdia] First there must be a meeting of the foreign ministers of the six republics, which should then be followed by a summit meeting.

[TURKIA] Has this bloc been formed to struggle against the Kremlin?

[Gamsakhurdia] No, not to engage in a struggle, but to defend itself against aggression from Moscow. Our relations [with the Union] will be on cultural and economic bases. Furthermore, when we leave [the Union], we want to have good relations with the Soviet Union.

[TURKIA] The seven leading industrial countries are seeking to extend aid to Gorbachev in the form of hard currency (there is talk of this amounting to billions of dollars). Is the Soviet economy really in such a difficult situation?

[Gamsakhurdia] It is in a very difficult situation, and this is because the Soviet Union is continuing to try to strengthen the military-industrial complex. It still wants to be the leading military power and, by means of military force, to have hegemony in the world. It wants these billions in order to maintain its military-industrial complex, prevent the catastrophic collapse of its economy, and preserve internal stability.

[TURKIA] Do the Red Army and KGB maintain their previous strength?

[Gamsakhurdia] The army, of course, has the same power. However, the KGB does not interfere in political life as blatantly and actively as it used to; more precisely, it no longer openly interferes, although, of course, it represents a powerful factor in the struggle to preserve totalitarianism.

[TURKIA] I would like to return to the subject of Georgia. Can you possibly give a date as to when Georgia will truly become independent?

[Gamsakhurdia] It is not possible to give a precise date. However, everything depends on the signing of the Union treaty by the Nine plus One republics, on the date of the signing, and on the position that they adopt toward the six "recalcitrant" republics.

[TURKIA] Mr. President, what kind of administrative and economic system do you want to have in Georgia today?

[Gamsakhurdia] Only a democratic one. Georgia is a republic with its own president. This system will undergo further improvement. Georgia has a parliament made up of many parties that fulfills an active role. It unites the representatives of 10 parties.

[TURKIA] Including the Communist Party?

[Gamsakhurdia] Yes, but this party no longer has any political force. The people have turned their backs on it.

[TURKIA] Turkey, as you know, is a neighboring country. It converted to a free market economic system 10 years ago. We believe that, precisely today, when a new stage is beginning in Georgia's struggle for freedom and economic independence, we know what it means to convert to a free market economic system as we ourselves have passed through approximately the same complicated transitional stage on the path toward democracy. How do you view Turkey and what benefits do you expect it to bring you? Do you think that perhaps Turkey can be the door to Europe for you?

[Gamsakhurdia] This is indeed what we would like. We are neighbors united by traditional bonds of friendship and we should restore the best relations at every level. The Kremlin's imperial forces are doing everything they can to hinder the establishment of goodneighborly relations between our states. They are spreading all manner of disinformation both here and in Turkey. However, given that we consider Turkey to be a European state and a signatory of the Helsinki Accord, we view it as a reliable partner.

[TURKIA] Will you use Turkey's experience in your conversion to a free market economic system?

[Gamsakhurdia] Of course. We will, without fail, invite experts to our country.

[TURKIA] If I am not mistaken, the Turkish ambassador to the USSR visited you quite recently.

[Gamsakhurdia] Yes, that is right. Our conversation covered the development of future relations at every level.

[TURKIA] Do you have the necessary cadres and base to facilitate a painless conversion to a free market economy?

[Gamsakhurdia] This process will probably be slightly delayed because, until we completely separate from the Soviet Union, it will be difficult for us to have complete economic independence. As you know, we are still a part of the Soviet economic system. It would be of enormous help to us along this path if Turkey were to recognize the Republic of Georgia and establish diplomatic relations with us.

[TURKIA] What is your attitude toward foreign capital investment?

[Gamsakhurdia] Of course, such investment would be very welcome. Naturally, there would have to be certain reliable guarantees. This practice would have to conform to the law and state control would be maintained.

[TURKIA] We have frequently come across American flags in Georgia. What are your relations with this state? Are you receiving any kind of help from it?

[Gamsakhurdia] We have good relations. Right now, talks are taking place regarding my future meeting with George Bush in Washington. The position of the American administration toward our problem finally will soon become clear. The American Congress is very well disposed toward Georgia. It often discusses our problem and a delegation of congressmen will soon be visiting us.

[TURKIA] Have you received any material assistance?

[Gamsakhurdia] Not to any significant extent. However, we do have certain economic relations.

[TURKIA] Two systems exist in the world: capitalism and socialism. To which will you adhere?

[Gamsakhurdia] Our aim is to restore the capitalist system but with the preservation of a certain amount of state control.

[TURKIA] Are you thinking about joining NATO?

[Gamsakhurdia] We haven't come to any decision on this yet. Time will tell.

[TURKIA] How will Georgia defend itself?

[Gamsakhurdia] A Georgian Army is in the process of being formed. We want to establish friendly military relations with our neighboring countries.

[TURKIA] Are Georgians serving in the Soviet Army?

[Gamsakhurdia] We have abolished the Union law that made conscription in the Soviet Army compulsory for Georgian youths. They now do their military service in the Georgian guard.

[TURKIA] You earlier mentioned regional conflicts. I would like to ask you about Adzharia. Hundreds of rumors are being spread. There are 400,000 Muslims living here. It is being said that they are prohibited from practicing their faith, they cannot give their children Muslim names, there is no Koran in Georgian, and that they are being oppressed. As a democratic regime, do you intend to support the Muslims?

[Gamsakhurdia] You have been misinformed. First, the number is greatly inflated. Moreover, it is, for the most part, the elderly who profess this faith. All their rights are guaranteed: They have their own mosques; nobody is persecuted; nobody is prevented from practicing his or her faith; in Adzharia, very many have Muslim names; there is a Muslim society; and so forth. I have good personal relations with the qadi in Batumi. The Koran exists in Georgian and it is readily available. It is possible that the Muslims were oppressed under the Communists, but no longer! However, we also are opposed to the persecution of Christians by Muslims.

[TURKIA] President Ozal has put forward a proposal for the creation of an economic union of Black Sea states. At present, Georgia also figures, in theory, in this proposal.

[Gamsakhurdia] We like this idea and we will take an active part in the elaboration of this proposal, particularly in view of the acute ecological problems facing the Black Sea. In general, we want to establish representation in Turkey. We will have to wait and see. Many countries want to establish close economic and cultural ties with us but, presently, they want to avoid worsening relations with Moscow.

[TURKIA] Finally, as Georgia's president, what message have you for the Turkish people?

[Gamsakhurdia] I would like to wish the Turkish people all the best and to express my faith in the establishment of model good-neighborly relations between our countries. We hope that the Turkish people will help us and that your state will give diplomatic recognition to the Republic of Georgia.

[TURKIA] Mr. President, thank you very much for granting us this interview, which will be published on the paper's front page. We wish you and your motherland happiness and peace.

International Observers Assess Georgian Elections

AU1806125491 Tbilisi SVOBODNAYA GRUZIYA in Russian 7 June 91 p 1

[SAKINFORM report on visit by members of human rights organization to observe Georgian presidential elections: "The International Society for Human Rights"]

[Text] The elections in Georgia were held overall in a correct manner.

Observers from the International Society for Human Rights [ISHR] have summed up the results of their stay in Georgia.

"By and large without incident and in a correct manner"—that is how observers from the ISHR, based in Frankfurt am Main, assessed the Georgian presidential elections after their return.

The result of the 26 May elections was that Zviad Gamsakhurdia (born 1939), candidate of the "Roundtable—Free Georgia" bloc, won by a clear majority.

After 90 percent of the votes had been counted, as the ISHR observers learned on Monday [27 May] at a press conference in the Georgian capital Tiflis (Tbilisi), 87.8 percent of the electorate voted for Gamsakhurdia. Valerian Advadze, who was put forward by the Georgian Union of National Accord and Rebirth and who belongs to the Communist reform bloc, obtained 7.8 percent of the vote. The other four candidates were left way behind.

According to preliminary figures, 83.15 percent of the electorate took part in the elections.

Immediately after their arrival, the ISHR observers held a press conference in Frankfurt am Main on 28 May, at which they reported that they had visited various polling stations in the autonomous oblast of Abkhazia—where nationalist clashes had occurred several months ago—and confirmed that the presidential ballot had been free and secret. The local electoral commissions had comprised members of various national groups, including Abkhazians, Georgians, Russians, and Jews.

An exchange of opinions with colleagues and journalists who had observed the course of the elections in other regions of Georgia confirmed that the elections had been held properly. The exceptions were two towns in Abkhazia, and the Ossetian region in north Georgia, where the elections were boycotted due to nationalist strife. According to Georgian figures, a little over 100,000 people live in the areas which were affected by the boycott. The total population of Georgia is 5,500,000.

In the Ossetian region, where the status of "autonomous oblast" was annulled by the Georgian Parliament several months ago because of the conflict, passers-by who were questioned said that they would in no way take part in the elections since they considered themselves to be not part of Georgia, but part of the North Ossetian Autonomous Oblast, which belongs to the Russian Federation, and therefore they wanted to remain in the USSR. Georgia, of course, views the elections as a further step toward its independence. At the same time, however, Ossetians from Tsinkhvali, which the ISHR observers also visited, admitted that their cultural and linguistic autonomy was guaranteed by the Georgian Government and that they had Ossetian schools, scientific establishments, and an institute in their region.

Zviad Gamsakhurdia assured the ISHR members during a detailed discussion that even after the tension fell, he would not alter his view of the problem and that this does not affect the autonomy of Abkhazia. He accused the Soviet central government of inciting nationalist conflicts and providing the militants with weapons from army arsenals in order to destabilize the situation in Georgia.

Contrary to this, one Soviet major in an assault unit that had been sent to the Abkhaz capital Sukhumi a week before the elections told an ISHR representative that this decision had been made a year before and had nothing to do with Georgian independence or the elections.

At the end of their stay in Georgia, the ISHR members dismissed rumors that the Georgian Helsinki Movement, of which Gamsakhurdia was one of the founders, had been expelled from the ISHR. Cooperation between them was continuing and should become further strengthened in the future.

The ISHR also made some criticisms. For example, there were many facts indicating that during the election campaign the other presidential candidates were given limited opportunities to present their political programs in the media. In addition, 70 people are under arrest in Georgia who, according to Gamsakhurdia, are criminals and terrorists. The opposition, however, considers them to be "political prisoners." The ISHR demanded the President to bring them to trial as soon as possible, and that the case be heard fairly in order to put an end to their questionable confinement under arrest. Among others, they include Dzhaba Ioseliani (born 1926), leader of the Georgian "Mkhedrioni" legion, who had previously served a sentence for robbery and murder. Gamsakhurdia agreed to this demand. The trial of Ioseliani will begin in August 1991.

Georgia's Democratic Center Elects Ruling Body

AU1806184691 Tbilisi SAKARTVELOS RESPUBLIKA in Georgian 11 Jun 91 p 4

["Information on the Session of the Republic of Georgia Supreme Council 'Democratic Center' Faction"—place and date not given]

[Text] The regular session of the "Democratic Center" faction has taken place at which organizational questions were discussed. The faction has elected Nodar Nat'adze as its chairman, Roman Gots'iridze as vice-chairman, and Anzor Sichinavi as secretary. The faction's working structures have been formed and the following chairmen have been elected:

David Berdzenishvili—The Political Commission
T'edo Ninidze—The Juridical Commission
Eldar Shengelaia—The Commission for Humanitarian Questions and the Protection of Human Rights
T'amaz Diasamidze—The Commission for Administrative and Territorial Organization
Paata Koghuashvili—The Agrarian Commission
Givi Lobzhanidze—The Commission for Health Protection and Social Questions
Akaki Bobokhidze—The Commission for Defense.

The Secretariat of the "Democratic Faction."

New NKAO Leaders View Contact With Azerbaijan

NC1906125991 Yerevan Radio Yerevan International Service in Armenian 1630 GMT 18 Jun 91

[Text] As previously reported, Leonard Petrosyan has been appointed acting chairman of the oblast soviet executive committee of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO].

Political circles view his appointment as the highest oblast official as a coup organized by those who favor negotiations with Azerbaijan.

USSR People's Deputy Genrikh Pogosyan is the most outspoken advocate of negotiations. In fact, Petrosyan is where he is to implement Pogosyan's policy.

Petrosyan maintains close ties with Polyanichko, the chairman of the so-called Republican Organizational Committee.

As announced at a closed-door meeting with the Intellectuals' Society on 14 June, an agreement with Azerbaijan exists now on certain economic matters. During the meeting, Petrosyan said: We have to isolate all those who disagree with our policy of negotiations. He added: All measures will be taken against the opponents of the policy, including the use of the Azerbaijani Special Purpose Militia Detachment. Replying to a question on whether the issue of the deported people will be included on the agenda of the talks with Azerbaijan, Petrosyan said that he cannot assume the responsibility of answering that question.

Almost all Armenians are being released from Azerbaijani prisons on the grounds that their sentences are up. However, certain political circles view this as a payback for the new leadership's policy. It is assumed that the aim behind the releases is to enhance Petrosyan's prestige in the eyes of the people and vindicate his policy.

Army Helicopters Transport Deportees to Armenia

NC1906124191 Yerevan Radio Yerevan International Service in Armenian 1630 GMT 18 Jun 91

[Text] Three military helicopters have landed in the Akner village in Gorisskiy Rayon. Reports indicate that soldiers used these helicopters to forcibly transport people from Nagorno-Karabakh to Akner.

Military helicopters also landed in Ishkhanasar, three km from Sisian, near Tolors reservoir 1 and ½ km from the city of Tolors.

According to the duty officer at the Sisian city branch of the Internal Affairs Ministry, the 24 people from Nagorno-Karabakh who got out of the second helicopter were quickly sent to Yerevan. The residents of Mardakertskiy Rayon who were taken out of the first helicopter were sheltered in the school of Ishkhanasar. They refuse to answer reporters' questions and are insisting that they are not refugees. They are claiming that they have urgent business in Armenia and that is why they each paid 500 rubles to have the Russian soldiers transport them to Armenia. The Sisian administration provided them with cars to take their personal effects to Yerevan.

Polyanichko Warns Armenia of Territory Loss

NC1806204691 Yerevan ARMENPRES International Service in Armenian 1215 GMT 14 Jun 91

[Text] Yerevan, 14 Jun (ARMENPRES)—It is said the more one eats, the less satisfied one becomes. Viktor Petrovich Polyanichko, former adviser to the leader of Afghanistan and executor of the empire's subjugation policy in that country, now occupies the chair of the second secretary of the Azerbaijani Communist Party Central Committee and has taken a leading position among those who are taking away the population of Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast from the Armenians.

Polyanichko now has declared that Zangezur, southeastern Armenia, also is Azerbaijani territory and has warned that if the Armenian Republic has resolved to secede from the USSR, then the issue of Zangezur also must be resolved and the region annexed to Azerbaijan before the secession. This was reported today by the newspaper HAYASTAN, published in Armenia.

The paper also said a list has been prepared in Stepanakert of those slated to be expelled from the oblast. The lists have already been distributed to pertinent organs so arrests can be made when ordered.

Armenian Criminal Code Amended

PM2006124191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 19 Jun 91 Union Edition p 7

[Report by Sergey Bablumyan: "When Persuasian Is Powerless"]

[Text] Yerevan—Substantial changes and additions introduced by the Armenian Supreme Soviet to the relevant chapters of the law will force people to respect the Criminal Code.

The need to increase citizens' responsibility for violating existing legislation has long been urgent. Cases of the arbitrary seizure of land, the cutting down of green plantations, and trade in unauthorized places have become more frequent and are now virtually mass-based. A somewhat distorted idea of democratic liberties and legal nihilism have generated arbitrariness among citizens fraught with very serious consequences.

Under these conditions the Armenian parliament has deemed it necessary to introduce changes and additions to the republic's criminal and administrative codes. In particular people who arbitrarily occupy housing space will be fined 500-1,000 rubles. A fine of 1,500-2,000 rubles is envisaged for officials who fail to take measures to protect green plantations under their jurisdiction.

Trade in unauthorized places entails a monetary fine and the confiscation of the items which are being traded.

Army Still Shelling Armenia's Kapan Airport

NC2006084391 Yerevan Radio Yerevan International Service in Armenian 1630 GMT 19 Jun 91

[Text] Soviet Army subunits and OMON [Special Purpose Militia Detachment] stationed at Akhkent and Kazanchy villages in Zangelanskiy Rayon, after rendering totally inoperable the radio relay station connecting Yerevan to Kapan and Stepanakert, have continued the bombardment, shelling Kapan Airport with various types of weapons over the last few days. The firing usually starts late at night and ends early in the morning, and on the night of 17-18 June almost all the airport's buildings were severely damaged by the massive shelling from the den of the army and OMON brigands.

According to information available to Yurik Ambardzumyan, first deputy chairman of Kapanskiy Rayon Soviet, the army units stationed in Armenia should be coming to Kapan today to take control of the Azerbaijan border region.

Azerbaijan KGB Warns Against Armenian Terrorism

NC2006083691 Yerevan Radio Yerevan International Service in Armenian 1630 GMT 19 Jun 91

[Text] In an address given on Baku television, the chairman of Azerbaijan's Committee for State Security [KGB] has requested that the population be alert to avoid possible terrorist operations by so-called Armenian guerrillas.

According to the Azerbaijani Committee for State Security, two Armenian terrorists who allegedly carried out operations against city transportation facilities have been detained in Baku.

New Azerbaijan Council of Ministers Published

LD1206093391 Baku BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY in Russian 25 May 91 p. 3

[Text] By decrees of the president of the Republic of Azerbaijan, the following have been appointed ministers of the Republic of Azerbaijan:

Minister of internal affairs	Magomed Nabi ogly Asadov
Minister of health	Talyat Ali ogly Kasumov
Minister of Foreign Affairs	Guseynaga Musa ogly Sadykhov
Minister of agriculture and food	Muzamil Imran ogly Abdullayev
Minister of culture	Polad ogly Byul-Byul
Minister of public education	Rafik Babash ogly Feyzullayev
Minister of land improvement and water resources	Salekh Gilal ogly Gadzhiyev
Minister of communications	Shamil Gadzhi Aga ogly Musayev
Minister of trade	Agasalim Yagub ogly Bagirov
Minister of finance	Badir Dzhamil ogly Karayev
Minister of bread grain products	Ragim Dzhalil ogly Dzhamilov
Minister of justice	Alisaab Saftar ogly Orudzhev
Minister of road transport	Arif Azi ogly Aslanov
Minister of housing and communal amenities	Venyamin Stepanovich Mayorov
Minister of local industry	Agabba Iman ogly Abdullayev
Minister of social security	Lidiya Khudat kyzy Rasulova

The following have been appointed as chairmen of state committees of the Republic of Azerbaijan:

Chair, State Committee for Material and Technical Supply	Aydyn Shamil ogly Azizbekov
Chair, State Committee for the Affairs of Construction and Architecture	Dadash Mirza ogly Asanov
Chair, State Committee for Labor and Social Issues	Svetlana Chingiz Kyzy Kasumova
Chair, State Committee for Statistics	Azhdar Azhdarovich Aliyev
Chair, State Committee for Nature Protection	Arif Enver ogly Mansurov
Chair, State Commitee for Fuel	Namik Kyamal Mamed ogly Aliyev
Chair, State Committee for Work With People who Have Left Their Place of Permanent Residence	Shakir Kerim ogly Kerimov
Chair, Committee for State Security of the Republic of Azerbaijan	Vagif Aliovsat ogly Guseynov

Central Asia

Kazakhstan President Explains Proposal on Summit

OW1806114891 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1900 GMT 17 Jun 91

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] President Nursultan Nazarbaev of Kazakhstan was asked by IF [INTERFAX] correspondent during a break between sessions to explain his proposal to hold a separate summit of 15 republican leaders even if representatives of the central government do not attend it. He put forward this proposal in a televised interview aired by national television on Friday, June 14.

"I would not wish this appeal to be perceived as a call for the convening of a separate political meeting. We are compelled to do it by reality. If the center does not take the lead, then we have to help ourselves and to think what our life would be like this year, how to prevent a deepening economic recession and how to establish ties between enterprises."

Tolerance of Religion Eases Uzbek Draft Problems

PM1906151391 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 14 Jun 91 Union Edition p 7

[Report by correspondent A. Orlov: "Blessing Military Service"]

[Text] Current draftees in Uzbekistan are blessed by the clergy.

The spring draft is coming to an end in the republic. Whereas last year hundreds of young men refused to serve in the Army and Navy, now there is only a handful.

Under the new statute on military-political organs approved by USSR presidential decree on 11 January this year, we are organizing educational work in the light of the personnel's political views, national characteristics, and attitude to religion, Major General I. Furmanov, acting chief of the Turkestan Military District Military-Political Directorate, said. An enormous role has also been played by the agreement between the USSR Armed Forces General Staff and the Uzbek SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Government, which IZVESTIYA (No. 114) has already reported.

It took years to realize that freedom of conscience is a real concept. Today believers can, without fear of censure, wear tokens of their faith or talismans and keep religious items in their locker. And everyone will be able to visit without hindrance a church, mosque, synagogue, or place of worship in their free time.

[Orlov] Have relations between the Army leadership and religious faiths changed?

[Furmanov] Previously there were simply no relations whatever, but today, although our convictions and ideas do not always tally, we are conducting a meaningful and frank dialogue—in the interests of that section of young people who are believers. A meeting between Army political workers and Archbishop Vladimir of Tashkent and Central Asia was held recently.

Orthodox and Muslim clergy now visit units and have taken part in the work of draft boards in a number of military commissariats.

Uzbekistan Movement Hails Yeltsin Election

OW2006092391 Moscow INTERFAX in English 0930 GMT 19 Jun 91

[Following item transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The central council of Uzbekistan's popular movement "Birlik" (Unity) held a conference in Tashkent on Tuesday. Among other things it discussed the announcement of Russia's central electoral commission that Boris Yeltsin had been elected Russia's President. In this connection a leading member of "Birlik", Professor Muhammadamin Narzikulov said; "this is a victory for all democratic forces in the country". He pointed out that "Russia's example will help Uzbekistan proceed along the road of democracy, not totalitarianism".

"Panic and confusion are reigning in the camp of local reactionaries, because they allowed themselves to speak disparagingly about Yeltsin more than once", said Professor Narzikulov. "Now they will hardly be in a position to go on with their double-faced policy toward Yeltsin and the democratic forces, including those in Uzbekistan".

"Birlik" leaders sent a congratulatory cable to Boris Yeltsin, expressing hope that free elections will take place in the near future in Uzbekistan too.

Kyrgyz Pilgrims Continue To Depart for Hajj

LD1906152391 Moscow TASS in English 1033 GMT 19 Jun 91

[By correspondent Boris Maynayev]

[Text] Bishkek June 19 TASS—Another 151 pilgrims today left Kyrgyzia for Mecca and Medina, bringing the number of Kyrgyz Moslems on a Hajj to 500.

For the first time in the republic's history, such a number of pilgrims have left for Muslim sacred places, including Kyrgyz, Uzbeks, Darghin and Chechen, young and elderly people, Kyrgyz Islamic Centre President Sadykzhan-Haji Kamalov said.

They are expected to visit sacred places and meet the leadership of the World Islamic Centre. We are trying to employ 2,000 to 3,000 Kyrgyzians in Saudi Arabia and discussing setting up joint ventures, Kamalov said.

We are broadening contacts with Muslims in other countries. We have agreed with the U.S. Islamic Centre to exchange groups of children. In August, 30 young Kyrgyzians will leave for the United States and 20 U.S. children will arrive in Bishkek, Kamalov said.

This year's Hajj [word indistinct] 30,000 roubles to pilgrims. They have paid part of the money themselves, and Muslim communities paid the rest.

Recently, the number of Muslims in Kyrgyzia with its two-million population has grown. This year, 18 new mosques have been opened in the republic, bringing their number to 60 in the republic, which is twice more than five years ago.